



Functions of Code-switching in EFL Classrooms with Native and Non-native Speaker Teachers: A Qualitative Study in A Turkish University

A Thesis Submitted for the MPhil Degree in

English Language Teaching

Guller Pinar Bilgin

De Montfort University- UK

Supervisor: Dr. Anu Koskela

2019

Abstract

This study aimed to find out how code switching functions in EFL classes with native (NS) and non-native speaker (NNS) teachers by using classroom observation and interview methods. To reach this aim 162 B-level students and 8 teachers were observed for 16 audio-recorded classroom hours in the School of Foreign Languages Department of a private university. In addition, semi-structured interviews were carried out with all of the 8 teachers who participated in the research and 37 students in groups of 4 to 7 from each of the observed classes. NVivo technique was employed to categorise and store the data. The seven functions (themes) which emerged from the utterances made during the interviews and the classroom talks were; ‘motivating, activating and drawing attention’, ‘comprehending’, ‘feeling free while expressing meaning’, ‘cultural orientation’, ‘naturalness’, ‘negotiation’, and ‘feeling secure and relaxed’. Results indicated that there were not many noteworthy differences between the functions of code switching used by NS and NNS teachers. Both the NS and NNS teachers switched to the students’ first language for purposes such as helping them comprehend, feel secure and relaxed, motivating and activating them, drawing their attention, and for orienting to their culture. On the other hand, the students’ switching to L1 served comprehending, feeling free while expressing meaning, getting motivated and activated, feeling secure and relaxed, cultural orientation, naturalness and negotiating with the teacher. Both NS and NNS teachers let the students switch to L1 but their second turns following the students’ first turns in L1 were observed to be always in L2. It was concluded that students’ switching to L1 for functions such as naturalness and negotiating which occurred both in the NNS and NS teachers’ classes might involve some kind of resistance to using a foreign language, thereby hindering target language learning, whereas other functions of code switching might promote it.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background to the Study.....	1
1.2 The Aim of the Study.....	2
1.3 Research Questions	3
1.4 Significance of the Study.....	4
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 Code Switching and Related Concepts	5
2.2 Theoretical Approaches to Code Switching	9
2.2.1 Linguistic Approaches	9
2.2.2 Sociolinguistic Approaches	10
2.2.3 Psycholinguistic Approaches.....	14
2.3 Functions of Code Switching.....	15
2.3.1 Functions of Code Switching in Bilingual Communities.....	17
2.3.2 Functions of Code Switching in Second/Foreign Language Classrooms.....	20
2.4 First Language Use in the Foreign/Second Language Classrooms.....	23
2.4.1 Literature Opposing L1 Use in L2 Classrooms.....	24
2.4.2 Literature Supporting L1 Use in L2 Classrooms	25
2.5 English in Turkey	27
2.5.1 Importance of English in the Turkish Education System.....	27
2.5.2 ELT in Turkey	27
2.6 ELT Classrooms with Native versus Non-Native Speaker Teachers of English Language	29
2.6.1 Differences Between Native and Non-native Speaker Teachers in EFL/ESL Classrooms ...	30
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	32
3.1 Selected Research Methodology: Qualitative Research.....	32
3.2 Research Questions	34
3.3 Research Setting and Participants	35
3.4 Data Collection Procedures.....	37
3.4.1 Observation.....	38
3.4.2 Interview	40
3.5 Data Analysis Procedure	42

3.5.1 Conversation Analysis (CA)	43
3.5.2 NVivo: The Qualitative Data Analysis Software	44
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	46
4.1 Activating Motivating and Drawing Attention	46
4.1.1 Analyses of the Interviews with the Teachers and the Student Groups	46
4.1.2 Analysis of the Classroom Talk.....	49
4.2 Comprehending	62
4.2.1 Analyses of the Interviews with the Teachers and the Student Groups	62
4.2.2 Analyses of the Classroom Talk.....	65
4.3 Feeling Free While Expressing Meaning	73
4.3.1 Analyses of the Interviews with the Teachers and the Student Groups	73
4.3.2 Analyses of the Classroom Talk.....	75
4.4 Cultural Orientation	78
4.4.1 Analyses of the Interviews with the Teachers and the Student Groups	78
4.4.2 Analyses of the Classroom Talk.....	81
4.5 Naturality	84
4.5.1 Analyses of the Interviews with the Teachers and the Student Groups	84
4.5.2 Analyses of the Classroom Talk.....	86
4.6 Negotiation	92
4.6.1 Analyses of the Interviews with the Teachers and the Student Groups	92
4.6.2 Analyses of the Classroom Talk.....	93
4.7 Feeling Secure and Relaxed	101
4.7.1 Analyses of the Interviews with the Teachers and the Student Groups	101
4.7.2 Analyses of the Classroom Talk.....	104
4.8 Summary of the Data Analyses	106
CHAPTER FIVE	111
5.1 Conclusions	111
5.2 Limitations.....	115
5.3 Implications for ELT and Further Research	115
BIBLIOGRAPHY	117
APPENDIX 1 Interview Questions.....	126
APPENDIX 2 Transcription Conventions	128

List of Abbreviations

EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ESL	English as a Second Language
L1	First language
L2	Target language
METU	Middle East Technical University
NNS	Non-native Speaker
NNST	Non-native Speaker Teacher
NNST Int.	Non-native Speaker Teacher Interview
NS	Native Speaker
NST	Native Speaker Teacher
NST Int.	Native Speaker Teacher Interview
St. Int.	Student Interview

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

As a result of technological advances, migrations, commercial, political and educational relations across countries and globalisation, people from diverse cultures speaking different languages have come together with the need to communicate. This brought about a growing demand for getting in contact using widely spoken languages such as English, French, German, Spanish, etc. English is the one mostly used all over the world and besides providing a common ground for social, political, economic, scientific and technological communication, it is regarded the global academic lingua franca today (Jenkins, 2014). Thus, it is taught as a second or foreign language in many countries.

In search of the best way to acquire a language different than one's own, competing second/foreign language teaching methods suggested different approaches to the role of using learners' first language, ranging from promoting to limitedly letting or entirely avoiding it. Thus, 'code switching', which involves using more than one language in a sentence or conversation, has long been a controversial issue for scholars. Those who support the first language use (Atkinson, 1987; Van der Walt, 1999; Ustunel and Seedhouse, 2005; Van der Meij and Zhao, 2010; Ziegler et al., 2012; Machaal, 2012, etc.) highlight effectiveness in communication by removing the barriers like anxiety or inadequacy. Moreover, research on this matter (e.g. Liebscher & Dailey O'Caine, 2005; Ziegler et al., 2012; Machaal, 2012; Sali, 2014). reveals that code switching is not only encouraging for low competent learners through helping comprehension and reducing anxiety, but also serving discourse related functions like quoting, emphasising, topic change and participant- related affective functions. Thus, several researchers hold the view that for effective communication, Hymes' (1972) 'communicative competence' as actual performance in social situations is more important than Chomsky's (1965) 'linguistic competence', which involves ideal speaker-listener in a completely homogenous speech community. As it is essential to express one's thoughts, ideas and feelings thoroughly, a non-native speaker may need to switch to his/her first language to communicate effectively. As Cook (2001) argued, language learners need to incorporate the first language and the target one rather than compartmentalising the two in their

minds. Specifically, as English is a lingua franca and used by non-native speakers all over the world, some minor deviations from the native English language norms may be viewed not errors to be avoided but contributions of people from different linguacultural backgrounds (Jenkins, 2014).

1.2 The Aim of the Study

Since many scholars argue that use of the first language is helpful for foreign language learners and should be allowed, Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher (2009) proposes that the alternation between the first and the target language requires reconceptualising the foreign language classroom as a bilingual setting and language learners as aspiring bilinguals like real bilinguals in a bilingual community. Conversation counterparts (teacher-student, or student-student) in the second/foreign language classroom consistently adapt to or try to direct each other's language use. Thus, many researchers (Lin, 1990; Auer, 1995; Ustunel & Seedhouse, 2005 ; Ziegler et al., 2012) hold the view that beginning with 1980's, bilingual classroom talk has evolved into an understanding that focuses on the ways in which teachers and learners achieve coordination of behaviour through sequential flow of classroom discourse. For communicative competence, utterances made by a speaker has to be comprehensible for their conversation counterpart (Krauss & Fussell, 1991). This may imply that in foreign/second language classrooms, receiving a response from the counterpart as a feedback to what a conversation part has said recently, s/he may have to change the language s/he uses regarding the need or expectation of the counterpart. Thus, in EFL classrooms of teachers who are NS or NNS of the language, teachers and students may need to change the language they use from time to time for various purposes such as, to understand or explain something better, to draw attention, to reduce anxiety, to emphasise identity, etc. during the flow of classroom discourse.

In the context of English language teaching, 'native speaker' (NS) teachers of the English language refer to teachers from countries such as, UK, USA, Australia, New Zealand and Canada whose first language is English whereas 'non- native speaker' (NNS) teachers of the language refer to teachers of the English language whose first language is not English. Although the NS teachers can understand and use some

Turkish words as a result of having been living in Turkey, the function and frequency of code switching are expected to differ between NS and NNS teachers' classrooms. Interviews were held with all of the teachers of the observed classes and the students who were observed to switch to L1.

Thus, the study is mainly concerned with finding out the functions of learner and teacher code switching in EFL classrooms with native and non-native speaker teachers of the language. Besides, it aims to answer the specific questions below:

1.3 Research Questions

The following questions were concerned in this study:

1. Do non-native speaker (NNS) teachers switch to students' L1 in EFL classes? (the data obtained through observation were used.)
 - 1.1 How and why do NNS teachers switch to students' L1? (the data obtained through observation were used.)
 - 1.2 What do NNS teachers believe that they switch to students' L1 for? (the data obtained through teacher interview were used.)
2. Do students switch to L1 among themselves? (the data obtained through observation were used.)
 - 2.1. How and why students switch to L1 among themselves? (the data obtained through observation were used.)
 - 2.2. What do students believe that they switch to L1 among themselves for? (the data obtained through student interview were used.)
3. Do students switch to L1 in NS teachers' classes? (the data obtained through observation were used.)
 - 3.1. How and why do students switch to L1 in NS teachers' classes? (the data obtained through observation were used.)
 - 3.2. What do students believe that they switch to L1 in NS teachers' classes for? (the data obtained through student interview were used.)

3.3.What do NS teachers believe that students switch to L1 in their classes for?
(the data obtained through NNS teacher interview were used.)

4. Does students' code switching differ in NS and NNS teachers' classes? (the data obtained through observation were used.)

4.1.How and why does code switching differ in NS and NNS teachers' classes?
(the data obtained through observation were used.)

4.2.What do students believe that their code switching in NS and NNS teachers' classes differs for? (the data obtained through student interviews were used.)

1.4 Significance of the Study

Various functions of teacher and student code switching in second/ foreign language classrooms are specified by many researchers (Martin-Jones, 1995; Turnbull and Arnett, 2000; Macaro, 2001; Levine, 2003; Ustunel and Seedhouse, 2005; Canagarajah, 2005; Liebscher and Dailey O'Caine, 2005; Zhao, 2007; Van der Meij and Zhao, 2010; Ziegler, Sert and Durus, 2010; Atas, 2012; Sampson, 2012; Horasan, 2013; Sali, 2014; Samar and Moradkhani, 2014, Malik, 2014). However few studies have been carried out on teacher code switching in native and non- native speaker teachers' classes comparatively (eg. Llurda, 2004; Kraemer, 2006; Hobbs, Matsuo and Payne, 2010). The present study examines which functions learner and teacher code switching serve in EFL classes and if use of L1 serves the same functions in both the NS and the NNS teachers' classes. The rationale behind is that L1 is the common mother tongue of all the students in the examined EFL classes and they share it with their NNS teachers whereas they have to learn and communicate in L2 which is the mother tongue of their NSTs. Besides, the conclusions of the study puts forward some pedagogical implications as to learner switching to L1 for certain purposes should not be supported for it may hinder learning while switches which may enhance learning can be promoted by the teacher.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Code Switching and Related Concepts

The term '*code*' is a general name referring to languages, dialects and other language varieties. The tendency in bilingual or multilingual settings to alter codes from time to time has led to the emergence of the concept '*code switching*' as a research topic since 1980s. Different viewpoints of code switching some of which are interested in the structural aspects (Poplack, 1980; Myers-Scotton, 1992, 1993b) and some in the sociolinguistic aspects (Blom and Gumperz, 1972; Gumperz, 1982; Myers-Scotton, 1993a, 1995; Auer, 1995, 1998, 2005) have given rise to many concepts which formed the basis of research on how, when and why code switching occurs in bilingual or multilingual contexts. While theorists like Poplack (1980) and Myers-Scotton (1993b) examine code switching structurally in sentence basis, Gumperz (1972, 1980), Myers-Scotton (1993a) and Auer (1995) analysed it in conversational context. Besides being a syntactic and a pragmatic issue, code switching has a psycholinguistic dimension related with how a certain language (code) is activated in a bilingual's (or multilingual's) brain in the presence of the interlocutors (Grosjean, 1997). Thus, the knowledge and thought on the subject of code switching has expanded mainly in dimensions related to the form, the meaning and the mechanism in the brain.

Poplack (1980: 583) defined code switching as "the alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituents." Her approach was mainly structural, and the aspect of the phenomenon she was interested in was that code switching involved using some of the words, clauses or sentences of a language while speaking in another one. Another structural definition is "the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems" (Gumperz, 1982: 59). Yet, the definition which expresses Gumperz's notion of code switching better, emphasizing its sociolinguistic and interpretative features is that it is a 'contextualization cue' which speakers strategically use to mark their speech (1982:132-135).

Nilep's (2016: 17) definition seems more integrating of the structural and sociolinguistic aspects of the concept: "Code switching is a practice of parties in discourse to signal changes in context by using alternate grammatical systems, or subsystems, or codes".

There are certain concepts related to code switching which are slightly different from each other. One of them refers to the amount of the items of one language used in another. The term *alternation* stands for the multi-word use of a language in another one. Code switching involves both alternation and *insertion* which refers to using a single item of a language in another one which is more dominant (Boztepe, 2003). "Je parle Français, but I am not so competent." is an example for alternation whereas "I can speak Français, but I am not so competent" exemplifies insertion using French and English items in the same sentence.

Poplack&Sankoff (1984) have differentiated *borrowing* from *code switching* stating that the former is the process in which one language takes words from another to make them a part of its own vocabulary. However, in code switching, the words are used idiosyncratically. Poplack (1980) proposed that in cases where a lexical item from a *donor language* is integrated only syntactically, only phonologically, or not integrated at all into the *base language*, it is considered to be code switched. In borrowing, on the other hand, the integration should be not only syntactic but also phonological and morphological. Moreover, borrowing is related to language of a whole community whereas code switching involves individual use only. For instance, in the sentence "This singer has popular songs in his *repertoire*" there is borrowing while the sentence "Give me *un livre* please involves code switching.

Myers-Scotton (1992) opposed to distinguishing between the concepts of code switching and borrowing. Instead, she suggested two different types of borrowing : *Cultural borrowing* which stands for borrowing lexical items that stand for concepts new to the recipient language's culture to fill the gaps in its repertoire of words , and *core borrowing* which refers to borrowing lexical items that the recipient language already has equivalents in its store of words. Moreover, Myers-Scotton (1993b) introduced a different terminology for the recipient and donor languages in language alternation. She named the dominant language which has a recipient role in code switching process as the

matrix language, and the language that has a donating role, a few elements of which are used in the matrix language as the *embedded language*.

In search of a typological framework of the code switching phenomenon, the researchers on the issue have made different conceptualisations. As a result of her investigation of Puerto Ricans living in USA, Poplack (1980) proposed the concepts *intra-sentential code switching*, *inter-sentential code switching* and *tag-switching*. *Intra-sentential code switching* refers to switching within a clause or sentence whereas *inter-sentential code switching* stands for variation between clauses or sentences. *Tag switching* is defined as the insertion of a word or phrase from one language to the end or the front part of a sentence in another one. As the results of her research indicated that the intra-sentential code switching was particularly used by the 'fluent' speakers, rather than the less fluent ones, she concluded that this type of code switching was the most risky one to apply for less proficient speakers since it might violate the syntactic rules. Other research on the issue seem to support the idea. For instance, intra-sentential code switching was concluded to be problematic in determining the matrix and embedded languages of code switched utterances while making structural evaluations (Kebeya, 2013). Tag switching, on the other hand, being mostly free from syntactic restriction, was concluded to be the simplest type to insert. Tag switching is independent of the rest of a sentence grammatically being located in the head or tail part of it. In inter-sentential code switching, on the other hand, each part of the sentence with more than one code is consistent in itself and is independent of the other part in terms of coherence.

The term *code-mixing* is sometimes used as substitute for the *intra-sentential code switching* due to the fact that the integration of the rules of both languages is required only in intra-sentential code switching (Singh, 1985; Sridhar& Sridhar, 1980).

Code switching has also been handled as a semantic and pragmatic phenomenon rather than syntactic. After a research on language varieties carried out in a town called Hemnesberget in Norway (Blom& Gumperz, 1972), two different instances of code switching were observed and the concepts of *situational* and *metaphorical code switching* were put forward. Situational code switching involves a shift in language due to a variation in linguistic parameters (setting, participants, formal vs informal

relationship between participants, etc). Metaphorical code switching, on the other hand, is independent of the physical setting and participants. Although there is no apparent change in situation (setting and participants are constant), the change in language may occur due to shifts in topic and dual role relationships between participants . Having recognized the difficulty of analysing code switching in two distinct concepts as situational and metaphorical code switching, Gumperz (1982) put forward *conversational code switching* as an inclusive term which brought together *situational* and *metaphorical* types. *Conversational code switching* acts as a contextualisation cue like prosody, gestures, voice intonation, and signals meanings such as irony, attitudes and identity as well as changes in situation such as, the completion of a turn in conversation, introducing a new topic, etc.

The use of a wide range of terminology to signify similar concepts has sometimes been criticized by some scholars for it makes the phenomenon more complicated. For instance, Eastman (1992:p. 1) puts it, “efforts to distinguish *code switching*, *code-mixing* and *borrowing* are doomed”. However, since the issue of code switching is viewed from different perspectives, this variation in terminology seems inevitable.

The main concern of this research is the analysis of the functions of code switching in foreign language classrooms. However background knowledge on what code switching is and what it is not, together with various classifications, definitions and structural aspects of code switching can not be left aside and will be referred to from time to time while examining the meanings or functions. For example, students’ intra-sentential code switching may serve a sociolinguistic function rather than being a compensation strategy since it will require a grammatical competence to make sentences in target language. Besides, inter-sentential code switching may be applied strategically to compensate for deficiency in the target language by employing a whole phrase or sentence in the first language within a target language context.

2.2 Theoretical Approaches to Code Switching

The phenomenon of code switching is viewed from different perspectives. Linguistic approaches study the form of code switched sentences, while sociolinguistic approaches analyse the meaning they carry. Linguistic approaches seek generalizations and rules about structure of code switching whereas sociolinguistic studies rely on its contextual or interactional meaning. Besides these two, a third approach to code switching is the psycholinguistic one which investigates how brain manages different languages and activates any one of them during speech production (Grosjean, 1997; Riehl, 2005). The present study aims at analysing the utterances that involve code switching in terms of the functions they serve in talk sequences. However, the linguistic and psycholinguistic approaches explaining the structure of these utterances and the processes that take place in brain during code switching are also needed to be considered here, as background knowledge.

2.2.1 Linguistic Approaches

Poplack (1980) proposed two syntactic constraints about word-order equivalence between the languages involved in code switching. One of them was the ‘free morpheme constraint’. According to this perspective, codes might be switched after any constituent in discourse provided that the constituent was not a bound morpheme. For instance (Poplack, 1980: 586); in the code switched word ‘*eatiendo*’, the Spanish bound morpheme *iendo* has been affixed to the English root ‘eat’, so the free morpheme constraint is violated. In her other principle titled ‘equivalence constraint’ it was stated that code switching should “occur in discourse at points where juxtaposition of L1 and L2 elements does not violate a surface syntactic rule of either language”(Poplack, 1980: 586). One of Poplack’s examples for this constraint was the code switched adjective-noun phrase ‘a car *nuevo*’ which violates English language rules. English and Spanish have non-equivalent rules, and in English adjectives precede the head noun whereas in Spanish they follow it (Poplock, 1980: 587-588).

The Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model put forward by Myers-Scotton(1993b) explains the permissible structures that occur within a clause showing code switching. It involves Poplack's intra-sentential code switching. It depends on the role distinction it makes between the participating languages. The model restricts the contribution of one of the languages (The Embedded Language) so that only one language (The Matrix Language) accounts for the uniform structure of the bilingual clause. Two principles she proposed which support this asymmetrical contribution are the Morpheme Order Principle and the System Morpheme Principle. The former predicts that only the Matrix Language (ML) provides the morpheme order to bilingual clauses, and the latter claims that only the ML is responsible for the harmony in grammatical relationships in the bilingual clauses (e.g. subject-verb agreement). The Embedded Languagee (EL) participates supplying content morphemes (e.g. nouns, verbs) sometimes in grammatically well-formed 'islands' consistent within themselves (Myers-Scotton, 2002; 2005). For instance; in the following French- English code switched sentence the morphemes *building high-rise* follow the word order of the M, French, not English (Myers-Scotton, 2002: 139).

A cote il y en a un autre gros *building high-rise*

at the side there is another big building high-rise

Next door there is another big high-rise building

Thus, linguistic approaches mainly focus on the rules that determine the grammatical harmony between the components of the bilingual phrases or sentences.

2.2.2 Sociolinguistic Approaches

While linguistic approaches to bilingual speech concentrate on phonology, morphology and syntax, sociolinguistic approaches focus on context, interaction, function and meaning. However, in sociolinguistic approach there are two different views, one of which (Blom and Gumperz, 1972; Gumperz, 1982; Myers- Scotton, 1993a; Heller, 1992) presupposes the indexicality property of codes and the other (Auer, 1984; Auer, 1998; Wei, 1998) opposes to it and argues that codes are not indexical but gain meaning in interaction.

Blom and Gumperz (1972) and Gumperz, (1982) after analysing the functions of Bokmal and Ranamal in Hemnesberget, concluded that those two dialects were perceived by the speakers as separate codes, and had distinct social functions so that a change in social events (participants, setting, and topic) required a change in codes which he called 'situational code switching'. On the other hand, they referred to changes in the speaker's language choice when the situation remained the same as 'metaphorical code switching' and proposed that it carries an additional meaning besides the referred one. The teachers Blom and Gumperz interviewed, for instance, reported that lecture and discussion in the same class were considered as different social events, and after delivering the lectures in standard Bokmal they shifted from to the regional Ranamal to promote open debate (Blom and Gumperz, 1972: 424).

Relying on his analyses of various speech communities, Gumperz (1982) considered code switching as a contextualization cue which signals a change in relationships between people, the situation they are in, and the subject of the conversation. However, Gafaranga (2007) criticised Gumperz's concept of metaphorical code switching comparing it with the situational one which is employing the language which is appropriate to the situation and argued that in metaphorical code switching deviance from the norm serves a purpose. Myers-Scotton (1993a, p.55) on the other hand, argues that it is clear that in Gumperz's model "codes in metaphorical switches receive their social meaning from whatever that meaning is when they occur in a situational switch". She also states that much of the work on code switching would never have been done without the research carried out by Blom and Gumperz (1972).

Myers-Scotton's (1993a) markedness model of conversation analysis which consisted of three maxims was based on her *negotiation principle*. The principle, which was based on Grice's (1975) cooperative principle and Levinson's (1983) speech act theory, reflected the main idea of the model, which was that utterances have intentional as well as referential meanings, so a change in code could convey important meanings over and above the referential meanings. Myers-Scotton (1993a: 113) stated "Choose the *form* of your conversation contribution such that it indexes the set of rights and obligations which you wish to be in force between speaker and addressee for the current exchange." Thus, codes have the property of indexicality and different linguistic varieties in a

community's repertoire represent particular types of relationships (rights and obligation sets). Myers-Scotton (1993a) also added that a speaker's communicative intention involved not only the intention to convey a thought, a feeling, a wish but also the intention that the utterance would make it possible for the addressee to recognise the speaker's purpose. Code changes and social meanings of code choices depend on certain principles (maxims) for different relationships among conversation participants. Bilingual conversation partners know which code is the expected (unmarked) one in an interaction.

The first maxim is the *unmarked choice maxim* which implies that unmarked code choice is to be made when one wanted to establish or affirm the existing rights and obligations (RO) set. In that occasion, code switching will take place as a sequence of unmarked choices as each language used will be the unmarked choice due to contextual requirement, and there will be no embedded language. As an example: Myers-Scotton (1993a: 114) proposed a conversation of three interlocutors the first half of which was exclusively in English due to the presence of the English monolingual speaker, and the second half was mostly in Spanish as the other person was more comfortable conversing in Spanish. The *marked choice maxim* implies that code switching in an otherwise unmarked conversation (as the same language was being used) 'marks' the switched word, phrase or sentence as an embedded one (and a new RO set is established). The *exploratory choice maxim*, on the other hand, was proposed to be valid in cases when the interlocutors were not so sure which of the languages to use unmarkedly. The interlocutors switch codes to explore and decide on the unmarked choice (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 114).

This social psychological model was criticised for relying heavily on conversation-external knowledge, even including assumptions about what speakers understand and believe (Nilep, 2006). Besides, switching to languages were attached external meanings and values. Wei (1998) found Myers-Scotton's (1993a) distinction similar to Gumperz's 'situational' versus 'metaphorical' switching (Blom and Gumperz, 1972; Gumperz, 1980) in that 'unmarked choice' was like the situational switching while 'marked choice' resembled the metaphorical one.

Heller (1992) pointed out the relationship between code switching and identity. She viewed social functions of code switching from a socio-political perspective as a political strategy of social mobilisation for access to valued resources in the community. She argued that by using two or more different languages strategically, people could acquire two or more identities. For instance, her study revealed that anglophones in Quebec could achieve a position in francophone controlled corporate culture along with holding their anglophone identity which was usable on the international market. Thus, language alternation may provide benefits such as class membership and economic gains.

Auer (1984) emphasized the sequential function of code switching. Relying on his analyses of Italian migrant children in Germany, he claimed that there is no significant relation between topic and language use, in contrast to situational code switching proposed by Gumperz. Moreover, he did not agree with Gumperz's view of code switching as a whole. From his point of view, code switching does not carry meaning in itself as a contextualization cue. It is meaningful within the context, at the moment of interaction just like other contextualization cues such as gestures and prosody, etc.

He suggested that code switching was mostly preferred by subsequent speakers to maintain the language of the previous turn. This alternation could be used to mark contrast, to bracket a sequence from the preceding discourse or negotiate a common language (Nilep, 2006). Auer (1995) also criticized Myers-Scotton's model arguing that it was not always possible to determine which language is the 'base' or 'unmarked' especially in cases where interlocutors sometimes keep open the choice of which language to use.

Blom & Gumpertz's (1972), Myers-Scotton's (1993a,b) and Heller's (1992) approaches to code switching are macro-level for they ignore the context-specific meaning of code switched utterances during interaction among individual speakers. In their studies codes rather have social meanings in themselves and are related to group identities of interlocutors. Auer's (1984) conversation analysis is micro level as it stresses the 'emergent' character of meaning in code switching which is not just '

brought along' by the speakers, but is' brought about' by the interaction as the conversation is evolving (Wei, 1998, 169-170).

2.2.3 Psycholinguistic Approaches

Psycholinguistic research which focus on bilingualism handles code switching as a widespread phenomenon in bilingual speech. This approach investigates the process of the language choice in brain of bilinguals during speech production.

Grosjean (1997: 227) points out that each language of a bilingual can be activated or deactivated in presence of his interlocutor. When bilingual people are interacting with monolinguals they get in totally monolingual language mode. On the other hand, they normally mix languages when they are communicating with bilinguals who share their both languages.

Riehl (2005) brings into view a third aspect which is 'psycholinguistically motivated code switching'. The concept encompasses language alternation that is not intentionally resorted for a specific aim by the speaker but by the specific conditions of language production. While the focus is on the system in the linguistic approach and on use of language in the sociolinguistic approach, in psycholinguistic approach it is on the processes taking place in the speaker's brain. Relying on the 'interactive activation model' of language production (Dell, 1986) that allows parallel processing of two languages in the brain in contrast to Levelt et al.'s (1999) speaking model. Levelt et al.'s model depends on the idea of modular representation of two languages in the brain which implies that language choice is already made at the conceptual level. Therefore, the model employed by Riehl (2005) is the 'interactive activation model'. In her model of code switching, she claims that it is mainly unintentional on the part of the speaker to make a choice between languages. Psycholinguistically conditioned or non-functional code switching is non-intentional and is triggered by some words which are at the intersection of two language systems. This may cause speakers deviate from the linguistic way they are following and complete the sentence in the other language. Part of a dialogue involving German – English code switching Riehl (2005: 1949) gives to exemplify the model is as follows:

- “Es war Mr. Fred Burger, der wohnte da in Gnadenthal and *he went out there one day and Mrs. Roehr said to him: Wer sind denn die Manner do her?* (It was Mr. Fred Burger, he lived at Gnadenthal and he went out there one day and Mrs. Roehr said to him: Who are all these men around here?)”

Riehl's explanation was that Gnadenthal was the name of an old German settlement in Australia which was used both in English and German, so the presence of the word in both languages triggered the transition from German to English. Along with this, the second switch from English to German was not psycholinguistically conditioned but pragmatic (functional) for it served as the *quaotation* of direct German speech.

Examining the linguistic, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic approaches to code switching will help comprehending the concept in its structural and functional basis together with the processes by which the phenomenon takes place in brain. Although the main concern of the present study is the sociolinguistic dimension which involves the functions of code switching, how switches function can not be abstracted or separated from how they are produced in brain and in which forms they occur in bilingual speech.

2.3 Functions of Code Switching

The sociolinguistic approaches toward code switching have inspired many researchers in the field (e.g. Zentella, 1981; Wei, 1995; Nishimura, 1995; Alfonzetti, 1998; Ustunel and Seedhouse, 2005; Bullock & Toribio, 2009; Ziegler et al, 2012) to find out the reasons for code switching in different bilingual contexts, and thereby suggest interactional functions of code switching observable in bilingual settings. Some studies have focused on daily conversations within bilingual communities, like dialogues between family members or friends (e.g. Wei, 1995; Kwan-Terry, 1992; Saunders, 1984; Nishimura, 1995; Pan, 1995; Taura, 1996) whereas others are mostly concerned with the interaction in second/foreign language classrooms to analyse code switching in terms of its social and pedagogical functions. Although the present study is mainly concerned with functions of code switching in foreign language classrooms, code switching in non-classroom bilingual settings are also considered since code switching research in bilingual communities provide a basis for research on classroom code switching.

Research on classroom code switching (eg. Camilleri, 1996; Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain, 2005; Van Der Meij and Zhao, 2010; Jinxia, 2010; Ziegler, Sert and Durus, 2012) have revealed that the patterns of code switching and bilingual interaction similar to those in bilingual communities can be expected and have been found to emerge in those settings as well.

Researchers interested in social, sociocultural or functional aspects of code switching have pointed to various functions it serves in different settings. Gumperz (1982) identified quoting, addressee specification, injection, reiteration, message qualification, and personalisation versus objectivisation as functions of conversational code switching. He proposed that these functions are quite similar to the contextualisation cues that are used in a single-language speech such as, "prosody, paralinguistic signs and rhythmic patterns not ordinarily included in linguistic analysis but which turn out to be communicatively significant" (Gumperz, 1982), which are used in a single-language speech. Like other contextualisation cues, code switching may provide a means for speaker to convey information which involves inferential meaning beyond its referential content in interpreting a particular utterance (Nilep, 1996).

Ideas about functions of code switching have developed into viewing language as being chosen and language choice as a negotiated and determined phenomenon that defines the ongoing relationship between the interlocutors. Particularly, according to Myers-Scotton (1988) language choice functions to negotiate and determine a relationship instead of being determined by it as proposed by Auer (1984). Along with this, language is also conceived to be chosen by speakers for strategic purposes or to emphasise identity (Heller, 1992). In Auer's view, conversational interaction determining the dynamic relationship between conversation parts which may change in every new move has an important role in changing of code choice. The point reached by Auer (1998) as his contribution to the debate is that language alternation (code switching) should not be explained as mostly being determined by situational parameters or being purposeful and strategic. In his Conversation Analysis (CA) approach, code switching gains its meaning through sequential development of the conversation together with turn-taking and next-turn management by speakers.

Code switching has both *discourse-related* and *participant-related* functions in bilingual (or multilingual) community and second or foreign language classroom settings. In such interactional contexts, code switching serves both discourse-related functions which organize conversation by contributing to the interactional meaning of a particular utterance and speaker oriented and participant-related functions which are switches indicating preferences of the individual who performs the switching or those of the participants in the conversation and hearer oriented (Auer, 1998).

While speaking in a particular language, a speaker can employ a different one for purposes such as to convey a special meaning, to get closer to or distant from the listeners, to emphasise something, to change the subject, to mark identity, to make what he says more comprehensive for the listener, etc. Thus, in the present study classroom code switching will be analysed sequentially with turn takings, next-turn managements, pauses which redefine the relationships among the interlocutors (teacher-student, student- student) nearly at each turn.

2.3.1 Functions of Code Switching in Bilingual Communities

Functional analyses of code switching in bilingual interaction have yielded some knowledge about the uses of code switching in bilingual communities.

After analysing the two dialects (Bokmal and Ranamal) used in a town in Norway, Blom and Gumperz (1972) came up with two major types of functions they serve. Formal functions (those related to business matters) for which the standard language (Bokmal) is employed, and informal functions (greetings and those related to family matters) for which the local variety (Ranamal) is used. People were observed to switch between the two varieties as the topic, setting or participants change or just to create an effect like that of a contextualisation cue during conversational interaction.

Gumperz (1982: 75-79) suggested six common functions of *conversational code switching* which he then preferred to use as a single term covering both situational and metaphorical code switching: *quotation marking*, *addressee specification*, *interjection*, *reiteration*, *message qualification*, and *personalization versus objectivisation*. *Quotations* are changes in code which are used to report another person's utterance

directly or as reported speech. *Addressee specification* occurs when a message is directed to a particular person among the others present in the setting. *Interjections* serve to mark sentence fillers, as in the insertion of the English filler [I mean] in an otherwise completely German sentence. *Reiteration* occurs when one repeats a message in the other code to reinforce, emphasise or clarify what is said. In *message qualification*, to qualify a message a topic is introduced in one language and explicated in another. *Personalisation versus objectivisation* signals the degree of speaker's involvement in or distance from the message in the utterance reflecting it as a personal opinion or a common belief or fact. However, Gumperz's and many subsequent scholars' attempts to put forward taxonomies of functions were criticized and it was suggested that actual interaction should be observed instead of starting from assumptions about general effects of code switching (Nilep, 2006).

One other function of code switching is to signal *ethnic identity* (Myers-Scotton, 1988; Nishimura, 1995; Bullock & Toribio, 2009). Examining Kenyan bilinguals, Myers-Scotton has seen that English in Kenya represents the educated elite whereas their native language reflects their shared ethnicity (Myers-Scotton, 1988). Nishimura (1995) who studied the functions of the three language choices (Japanese variety, English variety, and the mixed variety) used by Canadian Niseis (second generation bilingual Japanese people) during their in-group speech reached results in parallel with those of Myers-Scotton (1988) about ethnic identity. The main functions found in this study were *topic introduction*, *quoting* and *expressing ethnic identity*. Canadian Niseis were found to employ English for filling gaps in their Japanese, and use Japanese to express shared ethnic identity in different situations. Bullock and Toribio (2009) also emphasized the functions of code-switching as a marker to show a group membership and solidarity.

The discourse functions of code switching put forward by Romaine (1995) are similar to those raised by Gumperz (1982), namely; *distinction between direct versus reported speech (quotation marking)*, *injections or sentence-fillers*, *reiteration*, and *message qualification*. Auer (1984) has put forward the *sequentiality* function of code switching and he argues that when a certain language is chosen by a participant for the organization of his/her turn, that choice will influence the subsequent language choices of the speakers.

He has also shown how Italian children in Germany switch from Italian to German to mark *topic changes*, *turn taking* and *change of addressee* (Auer, 1998). *Sequentiality* function of code switching is strongly emphasized in most of the extracts where it seems to be used as a tool to provide interaction and mostly *to elicit second pairs*. Auer (1984, 1995) also proposed that the use of code switching or pauses in dispreferred seconds of adjacency pairs may provide a smooth rejection as a communicative strategy or may be perceived as a sign of *non-cooperation*. That means changing the language or just remaining silent may indicate rejection. In other words, in his view it is not the switching to a particular language but code switching itself that serves a function by giving meaning or reflecting the intention why the utterance has been made in an interaction.

To find out the reasons for bilingual speakers' switching from one language to another, an investigation was conducted by Wei and Milroy (1995) with a Chinese community in Tyneside. In his analysis of the conversations among the bilinguals he has the dialogues, code switching was observed to be used in *dispreferred seconds* to soften a rejection. Other notable functions included *topic shifting*, *choice of addressee*, *to attract attention*, *elicit response* and *receive a subsequent reply after long pauses* and restart the interaction by doing so.

Wei and Milroy (1995) emphasised the point that code switching in bilingual communities is a resource used for interactional purposes and is mostly discourse-related being similar to other contextualisation cues in monolingual speech. There are, nevertheless situations where code switching serves participant-related functions like asserting the ethnic identity, building solidarity, or managing the impression on others about one's social class (Myers-Scotton, 1993; Heller, 1992). Code switching also serves other participant-related functions such as making the teaching/learning material more comprehensive, reducing the anxiety about making mistakes in foreign language classrooms which are discussed in the next section.

2.3.2 Functions of Code Switching in Second/Foreign Language Classrooms

Since the use of the first language (L1) was put forward as an effective tool in learning in contrast to the classroom approach defending the use of the target language only (e.g. Cook, 2001; Macaro, 2001; Levine, 2003), functions of code switching in second/foreign language classroom have started to attract the interest of researchers. The situation seems somewhat different from an ESL classroom or a bilingual community as the foreign language classroom is the only place where learners are exposed to the target language and the most frequent purpose of code switching is expected to be making students understand the utterances in L2 or make utterances in L2 themselves. On the contrary, Liebscher and Dailey O'Cain (2005) show how the students in an advanced EFL classroom use code switching not only for participant and but also discourse-related functions, resembling code switching patterns in non-classroom bilingual settings. Thus, they argue that a foreign language classroom may be conceptualised as a bilingual space.

Research on code switching in foreign language classrooms has raised several functions of teacher code switching. Mattson and Burenholt (1999) propose them as; *topic change*, *affective* functions (to reduce anxiety, to build solidarity), *socialising* functions (indicating friendship and solidarity) and *repetitive* functions (to clarify meaning, to emphasize, to attract attention). A more recent classification by Ferguson (2009) presents these functions in three categories: code switching for constructing and transmitting knowledge, code switching for classroom management, and code switching for interpersonal relations and humanising the classroom.

Another study adopted the CA approach was carried out by Ustunel and Seedhouse (2005) in an English as a foreign language classroom at a Turkish university. In the study, the relationship between teacher's pedagogical focus and language choice was analysed. The emphasis was on the sequential organisation of teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code switching. Taking the data from six EFL classes through conversation analysis, it was found out that code switching served different pedagogical functions. The teacher was observed to switch to students' L1 when long pauses of students slow down teacher- student interaction. Code switching was also found to have a *scaffolding* function in situations when the teacher switched to students' first language

to elicit the expected reply from students in target language. Besides, use of code switching was observed as a way of *modifying and simplifying* the linguistic context. Ustunel and Seedhouse found that in addition to helping the learners understand and use L2, the teachers switched to L1 for classroom management and affective purposes.

On the other hand, in a study conducted by Eldridge (1996, pp. 305-308) in a secondary school in Turkey, learner code switching was found to serve the following functions:

- *equivalence* (the learner's using the equivalent native lexical item when he/she lacks the competence for using the corresponding item in the target language),
- *floor holding* (the learner's filling a stopgap with native language use to continue without interruption),
- *-metalanguage* (talking about the language itself, making comments, evaluations and grammar explanation),

reiteration (the learner's repeating the message he/she has already uttered in the target language using L1 for emphasis and reinforcement),

- *-conflict control* (the learner's tendency to utter words indirectly in the other language to mitigate a face threatening act)
- *-group membership* (socialising, establishing group identity) and
- *-alignment/disalignment* (to keep or shift the focus from the pedagogical concerns of the classroom, assume the roles of a colleague, a superior or a friend, etc.)

In an survey carried out in Turkey involving open-ended questions, some of the native speaker teachers of English language stated that they find the use of L1 beneficial for students as it helps establishing rapport in the class. In addition, some pointed out that switching to students' language is a way of showing that their language is not totally left aside and if the students are expected to have an interest in the target language, the teacher should show interest in the students' first language (Bilgin & Rahimi, 2013).

An investigation carried out by Canagarajah (1995) in ESL classes of 24 secondary school teachers in Jaffna, Sri Lanka to analyse the code switched utterances yielded results highlighting certain functions of code switching. Canagarajah (1995) identified two groups of functions: *micro functions* which include those related to classroom

management (like *opening the class, negotiating directions, managing discipline*) and content transmission (like *review, definition, explanation, translation, negotiating cultural relevance*) and *macro functions* which involve values behind the codes, *negotiation of meaning* through the code choice, *negotiation of students' identities* and *co-group membership* through code switching. Canagarajah (1995) also adds that English was used for interactions strictly demanded by the textbook and the lesson and symbolised impersonality, informality, detachment and being alien. On the other hand, Tamil was used for all other personal, unofficial or culturised interactions indicating being personal, informal, spontaneous and homely.

Participant-related code switching is employed by learners in second/foreign language classes not only to compensate for their inadequate knowledge of the target language but for purposes such as to emphasise identity or to distance themselves. On the other hand, teachers are known to employ not only participant related code switching as learners do but also ones for the purposes such as *making sides, quoting, or moving in and out of the teaching/learning context* (Camilleri, 1996; Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2005). However, advanced foreign language learners engaged in content-based discussions about fields of study other than pure language learning are found to employ discourse-related code switching as well (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2005).

In basing their analysis on the interactional model of code switching suggested by Auer (1998), Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain have shown that the learners use code switching in discourse-related functions previously identified only in teacher talk and non-institutional conversation among bilinguals. They have also shown that while participant-related uses of code switching address the roles of students and teacher in the classroom and teaching context, discourse-related uses clearly resemble bilingual practices outside the classroom setting. Besides employing code switching to compensate for a deficiency in their L2 learning, they made frequent use of code switching to indicate changes in their orientation toward the interaction and toward each other. Discourse functions of their switches were contextualised as *adding emphasis, to sum up the end of a narrative, making asides, topic shift, quoting, role shifting, and attracting attention* when asserting her opinion (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2005).

In the present study both student and teacher code switching will be analysed in EFL classes with native and non-native speaker teachers regarding the functions they serve which are derived out of the data reached through classroom observations and interviews.

2.4 First Language Use in the Foreign/Second Language Classrooms

Influences of the first language (L1) use on foreign/ second language (L2) learning have been an issue of debate throughout the twentieth century. After the prohibition of first language use in the Direct Method and the Audio-lingual Method, as a response to the overuse of the first language in the Grammar-Translation Method, all contemporary teaching methods have employed L1 to varying degrees for various purposes.

Giving instructions and feedback, translating dialogues, providing a relaxing atmosphere, decreasing the anxiety of uncertainty and failure, enhancing self-confidence and self-efficacy, building solidarity and trust, and promoting interaction are some of the functions expected from the use of first language of the learner in foreign language classrooms. Yet the main aim was still leaving one's own language and culture aside as far as possible.

With Communicative Language Teaching, learners started to acquire language knowledge and 'communicative competence' through active participation and interaction while teachers are no longer a knowledge-giver but rather an organiser, a facilitator and researcher (Ju, 2013). Byram (1997, p. 42) goes a step further and proposes another way of teaching culture which does not necessarily mean abandoning one's own culture and draws on the notion of 'intercultural communicative competence', referring to "the ability to decentre and take up the other's perspective on their own culture, anticipating, and where possible, resolving dysfunctions in communication and behavior". Wiseman (2002, 208) defines intercultural communicative competence as "the knowledge, motivation and skills needed to interact effectively and appropriately with members of different cultures". Scholars following this view (Alptekin, 2002; Cetinavci, 2012) argue that the lingua franca status of English should be considered and it should be taught in a new pedagogical model as an international language whose

culture is the world itself, and successful bilinguals from different countries rather than native speakers should be used as examples in teaching materials.

In parallel with the development of language teaching methods, different views of code switching in ESL/EFL classrooms have emerged. Attitudes towards the use of L1 vary from banning or minimizing it to maximizing the use of L2, as Cook (2001) puts it. In parallel, Macaro (2001) argues that teachers take three different positions on code switching: the ‘virtual position’ which completely rejects it; the ‘maximal position’ which views it necessary because of students’ low proficiency in the target language; and the maximal position according to which code switching may both enhance or hinder target language learning.

2.4.1 Literature Opposing L1 Use in L2 Classrooms

Many researchers have defended the need for exclusive use of the L2 in monolingual foreign language classrooms mainly relying on ideas proposed by the outstanding theorists. One of them is Krashen’s ‘input hypothesis’ which states that a new language is acquired by understanding messages, and ‘comprehensible input’ is the fundamental ‘environmental ingredient’ in language acquisition (Krashen, 1991). This suggestion is complementary to Swain’s (1988) claim that more output and longer student turns would give a chance to produce a more comprehensible output in L2. In classes where L1 is entirely avoided, students are more exposed to the target language used by the teacher and they have to communicate by using it themselves, sometimes through trial and error.

Chambers (1991) argues that the theoretical basis for use of the target language can not be regarded a controversial issue. He states that learners do not need to understand everything that is said to them by the teacher. Switching to the first language undermines the learning process. It is functional not to know the exact native language equivalent of a word, phrase or structure for a learner. This view presupposes that exclusive use of target language allows learners to experience unpredictability and helps them develop their own in-built language system. Moreover, some scholars (e.g. Lightbown, 2001) even argue that use of L1 may cause negative transfer from L1 to L2.

2.4.2 Literature Supporting L1 Use in L2 Classrooms

Exclusive or nearly exclusive use of L2 may be considered having the learner leave outside the classroom what he has learnt in L1 so far throughout his life, and making him deprived of his useful tools. For Skinner (1985), exclusive use of the L2 is detrimental to the process of concept development as it sometimes provides an obstacle to connecting thoughts with ideas already developed in L1.

Support provided by native language use in ELT classrooms has been perceived to have a positive contribution by some scholars. Atkinson (1987) for instance, puts forward some facilitating roles of the L1 use in foreign/ second language classrooms especially with low proficient learners. These roles include lead-ins, eliciting the language, giving instructions, and checking comprehensions. By suggesting them, Atkinson (1987) emphasises the clarification provided by the native language while explaining situations and directing students for the tasks besides checking if the target subjects are comprehended.

Some research done on the issue reveal the supportive functions of L1 in L2 classrooms. Machaal (2012), for example, relying on the views of EFL teachers, students and policy makers in a Saudi college as participants, suggests the L1 has a mediating role especially to explain difficult words and structures. Teachers were found to use L1 (Arabic) as a pedagogical tool to establish rapport, save time, encourage cooperation and interaction besides the facilitating function to clarify complex structures. Another study carried out in Turkey (Ustunel and Seedhouse, 2005) some uses of L1 by the teacher in situations when there is no answer to the teacher's question which has been asked in the L2, to encourage learners to produce turns in the L2, and to induce learners to code switch. Sali (2014) carried out a research in a public secondary school in Turkey to find out teachers' use of L1 and their views about it. Results show that L1 use serves social/cultural functions such as establishing rapport, emphasizing solidarity and praising as well as managerial purposes especially giving pre-task instructions. Besides the mentioned functions, the primary function of code switching is stated as helping students with comprehension and successful completion of the tasks.

Cook (2001) suggests that as language classrooms are bilingual spaces, instead of compartmentalising the first and the second language in learners' minds, incorporating the two should be promoted. Van der Meij and Zhao (2010) examined the views of teachers and students on teacher code switching and concluded that both teachers and students perceive the classroom as a compound bilingual space where teacher code switching is preferred and needed. Van der Walt (1999) proposes a parallel view stating that allowing the use of learners' L1s is a means of avoiding the loss or devaluation of those languages and related cultures. Code switching is also referred to as the use of multilingual resources, and teachers' and learners' orientations to the use of those resources will result in the construction of a monolingual or multilingual classroom (Ziegler et al, 2012).

Teachers vary in their use of L1 in L2 classes (Duff & Polio, 1990; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). Duff and Polio state that the frequency of L1 use is influenced by factors like, lesson content and objectives, pedagogical materials, and proficiency level of teachers . Besides that, ESL and EFL contexts differ in use of L1 in L2 classroom. L1 use in the L2 classroom may be needed because of lower proficiency levels, lack of familiarity with daily uses of English outside the classroom, and learners and the teacher mostly have a common L1 in EFL classes. In ESL contexts, on the other hand, as L1s may be different among learners and the teacher (e.g. in UK, USA, Australia) or learners have higher proficiency levels and opportunities for practice out of class (e.g. in Aglophone African countries), L1 is rarely employed (Jin&Cortazzi, 2018).

Even though there are contradicting views about the benefits and drawbacks of L1, the common point is obviously the importance of maximizing the use of L2 in foreign/second language classrooms, since the main objective is teaching and learning L2. L1 may be employed sometimes as a tool to foster learning L2 by making it easy to use and understand.

2.5 English in Turkey

2.5.1 Importance of English in the Turkish Education System

The Turkish Republic founded in 1923 highlighted the importance of European languages, especially French and German, due to modernization processes, reforms and increasing relations with European countries. Yet it was not until 1950s that English became the most preferred or most promoted foreign language in Turkey. Turkey's membership of NATO in 1952 enhanced economic, political, and commercial relationships with USA. As Doğançay-Aktuna (1998:25) states, after the second World War, English replaced French as 'the language of international diplomacy to become the lingua franca for trade, banking, tourism, popular media, science, and technology'. Attempts to promote the spread of English in Turkey were officially started by the Minister of Education in 1957.

After 1980s, Turkish governmental policy fostered close political, economic, and commercial relations with the West, especially with USA, thus the popularity of English increased. During this period, successful career in any field started to require the knowledge of English, and the developing managerial and technocratic class was expected to graduate from English-medium universities (Atay, 2005). This expectation made English the most widespread foreign language throughout the country. By 1987, besides 15 German-medium, 11 French-medium, and two Italian-medium schools, there were 193 English-medium schools in Turkey (Doğançay-Aktuna, 1998).

2.5.2 ELT in Turkey

Today, English is taught as a foreign language in Turkey starting from primary education. Followed by German and French respectively, English is the most widely spoken foreign language by Turkish people. It is of benefit to small middle classes and viewed as a prerequisite for access to the best educational opportunities (often abroad) and the most favoured professions, or top government positions in Turkey (Yıldırım& Okan, 2007). However, only a limited number of students have the opportunity to learn the language in an efficient way. In traditional government schools (primary and secondary), 4-12 year-students who have chosen English are exposed to about 1000

hours of that language totally throughout nine years of their education. (MEB, 2010). Along with insufficiency of the time spared for language teaching, teachers feel demotivated by the methods used, which rely on memorization and grammar due to strict control and supervision by the government to check that the curriculum is followed step by step. Consequently, students do not learn English efficiently (ERG, 2013). Moreover, overcrowding of classrooms means that listening and speaking exercises are very difficult to carry out contributing to inefficient teaching/learning conditions.

Apart from these schools which constitute the majority, there are some private schools (some are government-sponsored) where the primary and secondary education (including high school) is carried out. At these schools where students are taught English intensively, the medium of instruction for most subjects is the target language. Besides that, there are a number of public and private universities some of which require getting very high scores at the university entrance exams (like METU, Boğaziçi, Koç, Sabancı, Bilkent) where the medium of instruction is English.

Karahan (2007) carried out research on 190 eighth grade students of a private primary school in Adana, Turkey. The results are interesting. Although the students are exposed to English in their school environment more frequently than others at public schools, they have only mildly positive attitudes toward the language and the related culture. They recognise the importance of the English language but do not show a high orientation towards learning it. Moreover, they are not tolerant to Turkish people speaking English among themselves. Besides that, in a survey conducted by Kılıçkaya (2006) attitudes of 100 instructors of non-language subjects at the universities in Ankara towards the use of English as a medium of instruction were examined. Results indicate that the instructors favour the idea of adopting Turkish as medium of instruction rather than English. Instruction in Turkish is believed to promote student learning better since students differ in their English proficiency levels due to diversity in target language backgrounds. Along with that, Doğançay-Aktuna (1998) states that in Turkish culture there are two conflicting motives: While there is a desire throughout the country to learn a foreign language for the instrumental gains it offers nationally, there is also an attempt to keep the national language pure from external influences.

Although some of the above mentioned research in Turkey reveal negative attitudes towards making English as a medium of instruction and some exhibited the resistance in learners to using it out of classroom within the daily life context, English provides prestige and job opportunities and is the most widely used foreign language in the country. Moreover, learning it is necessary in the as it is a lingua franca. Thus, qualified language teaching/learning conditions should be attained by better developed language education politics regarding the methods and materials to be used. Following recent techniques, and developing curriculum in accordance with the innovations should be encouraged to make the teaching of the target language as efficient as possible. It may be useful to remember that the main aim of language learning is communication, and communicative competence requires employing various strategies one of which may be using the target and the native language together when needed. Thus, in the present study, functions of code switching in a country where English is not used officially but taught as a compulsory subject in foreign language classes will be examined.

2.6 ELT Classrooms with Native versus Non-Native Speaker Teachers of English Language

The term ‘native speaker’ (NS) used for a person who speaks and writes in her/his first language (mother tongue) is a controversial one. In addition, birth place is regarded as an indicator of being a NS of a language (Davies, 1991). On the other hand, a ‘non-native speaker’ (NNS) of a language is a person who uses it as a second or foreign language but has a different native (first) language. Kachru (2004) proposed the term ‘concentric circles’ referring to three circles the inner one of which encompasses the countries- UK, USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. He identifies (NS)s of English as those who have grown up in those ‘inner circle’ countries. The ‘outer circle’ includes countries like India, Singapore, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan where English is used officially and as the language of instruction in school but not spoken by the majority. However, as Davies (1991) states, when a child acquires a second language at a very early age, produces spontaneous and fluent discourse, and gets commucatively competent the distinction between NS and NNS becomes ambiguous. Finally, the countries like China, Japan, Saudi Arabia, Taiwan are illustrated in the ‘expanding’ circle since English is used as a foreign language in these countries. In this sense, Turkey will be included in the latter

category, for in Turkey, English has no official status and is used and taught as a foreign language in classrooms, a small sample of which will be examined in this study.

2.6.1 Differences Between Native and Non-native Speaker Teachers in EFL/ESL Classrooms

Since the classification of native and non-native speakers of English highlights the difference between them in language use, a need has occurred for researchers to compare native and non-native English speaker teachers of EFL/ ESLclasses. Differentiation between these two categories of teachers in terms of competence, features, styles, strengths and weaknesses has been an issue of debate among scholars (Llurda, 2004, 2006; Medyges, 1994; Arva and Medyges, 2000; Braine, 1999; Mahboob, 2004; Cook, 2005). Llurda (2004) believes that NNS teachers are expected to adopt the formulation of English as an international language in order to develop a positive self image and feel to have rightfully entitled to teach a language that is not their mother tongue. He also argues (2004: 321) that a language can be used separately from its original culture and its dominant ideology, without compromising one's own cultural and ideological perspective. In Llurda's view, English as an international language approach will result in a decreasing role of NS teachers in setting the principles and norms on which this lingua franca will be taught in future.

On the other hand, Medyges (1994) provided a background to the comparative research to discuss the differences between native and non-native speaker teachers. He put forward four hypthses about the differences between NS and NNS teachers. They are:

1. NS teachers and NNS teachers differ in language proficiency
2. NS teachers and NNS teachers differ in teaching practice
3. Difference in their teaching practice may be attributed to their language proficiency
4. Both categories of teachers can be equally good on their own terms.

Subsequently, Arva& Medyges (2000) conducted a research in Hungary with five NS teachers of English from England and five NNS ones from Hungary. They found out that NS teachers were superior to NNS teachers in terms of communicative competence in

L2 as English is their mother tongue, whereas NNS teachers were stronger than them in knowledge of grammar. Another strength of NNs teachers was found as establishing empathy with students since they share the same mother tongue. NS teachers, on the other hand, were considered more motivating for students' communication in target language besides providing familiarity with the culture of the target language. The results also revealed that NNS teachers are stricter and coursebook bounded. For these reasons, students view them as authority and NST as helpers of practising skills.

Another research carried out by Jin and Cortazzi (1997-1998) aimed to analyse how views about language learning, methods used and definition of a good teacher differ in British and Chinese cultures. The results of the student essays revealed that Chinese students believed it was beneficial to learn creative thinking from British teachers. Chinese teachers, however, were found to be efficient for teaching grammar and vocabulary as well as error correction.

Several researchers who work on the topic highlight the superiorities of NS teachers to NNS teachers: Braine (1999) argues that NS teachers will be successful teachers of the English language only because they are native. In parallel, Mahboob (2004) states that NNS teachers need to improve their linguistic skills and adopt the teaching practices of NS teachers. On the other hand, some scholars (Medges, 1994; Cook, 2005) focus on the strengths of NNS teachers such as; providing L2 learners with a positive role model, being more empathetic to the needs and problems of L2 learners, being able to incorporate the learners' L1 as method of teaching L2 more efficiently.

NNS teachers, increasing in number all over the World and teaching a global language deserve being examined with respect to their teaching methods, styles, and approaches to learners of their own culture. As Llurda (2006) states the identification of the NNS teachers' main strengths and specific contributions to the EFL/ESL contexts has become more relevant than ever.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Selected Research Methodology: Qualitative Research

This study employed a qualitative research methodology, specifically observation and interview methods. Qualitative research is used in studies that involve phenomena which need to be described as they naturally occur in a certain context. As Mason (2002, p. 3) states, qualitative research is “based on methods of data generation which are both flexible and sensitive to the social context in which data is produced rather than rigidly standardised or structured or entirely abstracted from ‘real-life’ contexts”, and it provides “rich, nuanced and detailed data”. In this type of research, the researcher gets aware of what is going on, having a detailed view of the context, phenomenon being examined and the participants. “Socially constructed nature of reality” and the “intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied” are among major characteristics of qualitative research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 8).

Certain common characteristics are attributed to qualitative research by various scholars. According to Creswell (2007, pp. 36-39), these characteristics are as follows:

- Natural setting (as data are collected at the site where participants experience that issue under study.)
- Researcher as key agent of data collection (Researchers are the ones who actually gather the information)
- Multiple data sources (interviews , observations, and documents are used)
- Analysis of data inductively and interactively (Patterns , categories and themes are built from the bottom-up, from concrete to abstract).
- Focus on participants’ perspectives, their meanings, their subjective views
- Framing of human behaviour and belief within a social-political / historical context or through a cultural lens.
- Emergent rather than tightly prefigured design. Thus, all phases of the process, participants, questions, etc. may change after the researchers enter the field and start to collect data.

- Fundamentally interpretive inquiry which means that researcher reflects her/his role, the role of the reader, and the role of the participants in shaping the study
- Holistic view of social phenomena by identifying the complex interaction of factors in any situation. (Researchers are not bound by tight cause and effect relationships among factors).

As Denzin and Lincoln (2005) state, qualitative researchers employ a wide range of interpretive practices which enable them see the phenomenon from different angles and get a better understanding of it. These practices include case study, participatory inquiry, interviewing, field notes, participant observation, visual methods, introspection, life story, etc. Researchers usually have to employ more than one interpretive practices in a study. Cohen et. al. (2007) suggest a ‘triangulation’ which means making use of two or more methods in data collection process for validity and reliability issues in qualitative research.

There are some differences between qualitative and quantitative research. The most characteristic one of them is looking at the subject matter from inside or outside. Qualitative methodology enables the researcher to get closer to the subjects’ perspective by detailed observation and interviewing whereas quantitative research relies on more remote, inferential, empirical methods and materials and involves the measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables, not processes (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005).

In this study, the researcher needed to look from inside and collect data about code switching phenomenon which is detailed and sensitive to the flow of discourse in the social context (the EFL classroom). The focus was on participants’ subjective views and perspectives. The study design could not be tightly prefigured; there might be changes in the process, participants, questions, etc. regarding the conditions in the research setting. When these aspects of the study were considered, qualitative methodology with its above mentioned characteristics was found to be appropriate.

The research questions of the study involved “how” and “why” code switching was resorted to by the students and the teachers during the flow of classroom discourse. In addition, the conditions in the EFL classrooms were expected to be relevant to the code switching behaviour of the students and the teacher as the code switching phenomenon took place in the EFL context .Moreover, individuals and events would be observed in their natural setting without making an attempt to control the contextual factors.

The present study had an emic perspective (as Mackey and Gass, 2005 suggest) since subjects’ accounts for their behaviour and interpretation of events were obtained through interview technique, and the phenomenon under study was described and explained in terms of meanings they attach to them. In addition, the setting or context of the study, EFL classroom with its students and teachers was a bounded system in its natural conditions, and ‘what is happening’ was the focus of the study.

While in the research on classroom code switching the observation method has been widely employed (eg.Canagarajah, 1995; Liebscher and Dailey O’Cain, 2005; Ustunel and Seedhouse, 2005; Ziegler, et. al.,2012; Atas, 2012; Hobbs, et. al., 2010; Malik, 2014), or interviews are used together with observations (eg. Samar, 2012; Horasan, 2013; Mohebbi and Alavi, 2013). However, several researchers have conducted survey (eg. Jingxia, 2010; Van Der Meij and Zhao, 2010; Gulzar, 2010). In the present study observation and interview methods were used to supplement each other to explore the *how* and *why* of the natural occurrences of code switching in the flow of discourse in EFL classrooms.

3.2 Research Questions

The following questions were concerned in this study:

1. Do non-native speaker (NNS) teachers switch to students’ L1 in EFL classes? (the data obtained through observation were used.)
 - 1.1.How and why do NNS teachers switch to students’ L1? (the data obtained through observation were used.)

- 1.2. What do NNS teachers believe that they switch to students' L1 for? (the data obtained through teacher interviews were used.)
2. Do students switch to L1 among themselves? (the data obtained through observation were used).
 - 2.1. How and why students switch to L1 among themselves? (the data obtained through observation were used.)
 - 2.2. What do students believe that they switch to L1 among themselves for? (the data obtained through student interviews were used.)
3. Do students switch to L1 in NS teachers' classes? (the data obtained through observation were used.)
 - 3.1. How and why do students switch to L1 in NS teachers' classes? (the data obtained through observation were used.)
 - 3.2. What do students believe that they switch to L1 in NS teachers' classes for? (the data obtained through student interviews were used.)
 - 3.3. What do NS teachers believe that students switch to L1 in their classes for? (the data obtained through NNS teacher interview were used.)
4. Does students' code switching differ in NS and NNS teachers' classes? (the data obtained through observation were used.)
 - 4.1. How and why does code switching differ in NS and NNS teachers' classes? (the data obtained through observation were used.)
 - 4.2. What do students believe that their code switching in NS and NNS teachers' classes differs for? (the data obtained through student interviews were used.)

3.3 Research Setting and Participants

The research was conducted in School of Foreign Languages, English Language Department (Preparatory School) of a private university in Istanbul, Turkey where the language of education is English. Taking intensive English language courses there for one academic year, students are expected to reach a level of proficiency needed to follow the main undergraduate courses of their department. After having completed the

courses, they also have to pass the proficiency exam to have the right to start taking the courses of their own department.

The research was carried out in April 2016 and it lasted for 3 weeks. In the institution, there were classes with different levels of English which were beginner (A1), elementary (A2), pre-intermediate (B1), and intermediate (B2) and advanced (C-level). At the beginner and elementary levels, there were no native speaker teachers; at the advanced level, there were very few students in number; and the preintermediate classes had just risen to intermediate level at the time when the research was being carried out. Thus, only intermediate (B2) level classes which had the largest number of students and some of which had native speaker teachers were observed. The four skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) were being taught. The researcher observed eight intermediate classes (four being led by the NS teachers and the other four by NNS teachers) for two classroom hours each, which means a total of sixteen classroom hours. Thus, there were four NS teachers and four NNS teachers involved in the study altogether. The native speaker teachers (NSTs) were born and grew up in UK, USA, Canada and Australia whereas the non-nativespeaker teachers (NNSTs) were of Turkish origin. Since each class consisted of around 20 students, the number of the observed participants was 170 (162 students and 8 teachers) .

A ‘population’ in research consists of all members of the group a researcher wants to study, and sample is a smaller group of subjects representing the characteristics of the whole group. Accordingly, the population of this study is all of the intermediate (B2 level) students and their native speaker and non- native speaker teachers at the School of Foreign languages – English Language Department of the university, and the sample group is the EFL students and their teachers chosen among them. The population consists of all of the B2- level classes of the institution which means 15 classes, 310 students and 20 English language teachers only 5 of whom are native speakers of the language. However, some of teachers did not consent to their classes being observed and recorded. Thus ‘convenience sampling’ method (a non-probability sampling technique where subjects are selected because of their convenient accessibility and proximity to the researcher) was preferred instead of ‘random sampling’ which would give subjects equal chance of being chosen. The rationale behind it was that convenience sampling may be

used in qualitative studies (Cohen, et.al., 2007) and as Onwuegbuzie and Leech (2007) note, in qualitative research, it is essential to gain insight into particular educational or social processes rather than making external generalisations about a certain population.

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

Qualitative data were collected through observing and audio recording the chosen B2 level classes, and interviewing 37 students from these classes in groups of 4 to 7, and all the teachers (8) of these classes.

Although in qualitative research, information analysis and validity determinations can not be carried out numerically, some indicators of validity may increase the quality of the study. As proposed by Maxwell (1992), validity of the qualitative research depends on some criteria such as descriptive validity, interpretive validity, external validity, construct validity, criterion validity. The present study is in conformity with these criteria.

‘Descriptive validity’ is describing what actually happened, the factual accuracy of the account that is not made up, selective or distorted. In the present study, the classroom talks were audiorecorded, field notes were taken by the researcher and the transcribed classroom talk was transferred to the NVivo programme loaded in the researcher’s Personal Computer to be stored there and referred to during the analyses which increased the descriptive validity.

‘Interpretive validity’ concerns ability of the research to catch the meaning, interpretations, intentions that situations and events (data) have for the participants. Phenomena must be studied with respect to the meanings people bring (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). In the present study, the participants’ thoughts, perceptions and explanations related to the observed code switching behaviour in the classroom were received through interviews carried out on the students and teachers.

As Cohen et.al. (2007) also point out, ‘external validity’ is the extent to which the results can be generalised to the wider population in quantitative research, but in qualitative research it is comparability and transferability of results with those in similar settings. In

qualitative research, instead of making external generalisations, the researcher attempts to obtain deep insight into the process and practices within a context (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2007). Since generalizability is not an expected attribute of qualitative research, discussions about the comparability and transferability of the results which were discussed in Chapter 5, Sections 5.1.2. and 5.3 could provide some support for the ‘external validity’ of the present study.

‘Construct validity’ is operationalised forms of a construct, clarifying what we mean when we use a construct. In this study, ‘code switching’ involves changes in words , phrases or sentences from English to Turkish or vice versa during classroom discourse. Operational definitions of each concept (theme, function), given in Chapter 4, contributed to ‘construct validity’.

As the literature on research methodology (eg. Denzin and Lincoln, 2005; Cohen, et. al., 2007) suggests, the use of two or more (more than one) methods in data collection increases the ‘criterion validity’ of the research. In the present study, using more than one method helped the researcher interpret the data concerning not only how participants behave, but also what they believe about their behaviour. The results reached by the observation and interview methods were consistent with each other.

3.4.1 Observation

Observation is one of the basic tools if not the most crucial one of qualitative research. As Mackey and Gass (2005) state, it provides real, natural and rich data which give the researcher deeper ideas of the group under study in time. In this study, the main data collection tool was observation as what really happened in the classroom. The behaviour of the participants, the classroom talk with turn-takings, and initiations of (teacher-initiated vs student initiated) code switching were watched and recorded. Observational data was used to make interpretations about how and why L1 (Turkish) was resorted to by the students and the teachers in EFL classes.

Despite being a very fruitful way of gathering data, observation method has some deficiencies. First of all, participants’ motives for their behaviour can not be observed. Another point is that it is difficult to avoid ‘observer’s paradox’. The term is used for

the phenomenon that the presence of the observer has an effect on the observed although the goal of the observation is to collect natural data and watch things as they normally are. Typical behavior of the class may change due to the presence of the observer or the recording equipment. The researcher appearing with audio and videotapes may have negative influences on the participants. An 'obtrusive' observer may be the main focus of attention and cause the participants to behave differently. These influences decrease the validity of the observation. (Mackey & Gass, 2005).

Observation can be in different forms with respect to the degree of structuredness and the role of the researcher in observing the situation. The kind of observation carried out in this study was a highly structured one since what is being searched was predetermined by the researcher. In semi-structured or unstructured observation, significance of events for the researcher may change or be determined to varying extents while observing the situation (Cohen, et al., 2007). On the other hand, in terms of the researcher's role, the present study involved 'nonparticipant' observation for the researcher was not a part of the situation, did not participate directly in the activities being observed, and adopted a distant, detached role. Moreover, it was 'overt' in the sense that participants were aware that she was there for research purposes (Mills, et.al., 2010). (It could not be covert at least for the fact that informed consent would have to be obtained from the participants.)

Field notes were taken as brief summaries of what was happening during the observation of each classroom in order not to forget the key events that occurred throughout the lesson. Fieldnotes are observer records of observations made, containing descriptions of what the teacher expected the students to do, the teacher's verbal and non-verbal behaviour, the students' responses, the observer's impressions, etc. (Lodico et.al., 2010; Debbie, 2007). The classroom talk in the observed classes was audio- recorded to be transcribed and analysed later, concerning the code switching behaviour of the students and the teacher.

3.4.2 Interview

In a research, interview is a method of obtaining information about the opinions of participants on the subject matter through verbal communication between the researcher (interviewer) and the participants (interviewees). Information that cannot be observed in the setting may be reached through interviewing the participants. Mutual trust and rapport are essential to be built in getting detailed, deep and true information about the interviewee's thoughts, feelings and experiences through direct interaction.

In order to get the real and detailed information from the interviewees to be used in his/her research, the researcher should be careful with the possible problems the method carries. It should not be overlooked that the interview is a method prone to subjectivity and bias on part of the interviewer and moreover, avoidance tactics may be employed by the interviewee during the interaction (Cohen, et.al., 2007).

In the present study, semi-structured interviews were carried out. This type of interview is planned before it is conducted. As Lodico, et al. (2010) point out, researcher develops an interview protocol that includes a list of questions to be addressed to all of the interviewees. This helps gathering data in a systematic and focused manner. The researcher may change the order or wording of questions or add new questions or omit some of them due to unexpected situations encountered in the context. Semi-structured interview is a flexible data collection method for the researcher uses the list of questions as a guide and makes extensions around it to get more information. This type of interview uses the advantages of a structured interview on the one hand, being well-ordered and systematic, and those of a non-structured one being extensible. As a matter of fact, in the present study, the last question of the interviews involved 'narration'. Employing narration, the researcher takes the participant's story through ethnographic techniques such as diaries, letters, or interview and captures the rich data within stories of events under study. In narrative techniques, the influence of the interviewer should be minimal, the interviewee should not be interrupted during narration, and the interview should be conducted at the interviewee's own pace (Jovchelovitch & Buer, 2000). As Cortazzi and Jin (2006) note, narrative research focuses qualitatively on participants' experience and the meanings they attribute to that experience. In this respect, accounts

and interpretations of educational events by teachers and students provide rich data for classroom research.

In the present study, the teachers were interviewed individually whereas the student interviews were in the form of 'group interviews'. Researchers can use group interview which is the systematic questioning of several individuals simultaneously, as a more efficient way of using resources and for adding valuable insight to the interpretation of a social or behavioural event (Frey and Fontane, 1991). Group interviews can be in structured, semistructured or unstructured format. This form of interviewing was used in the present study for the researcher thought it would be time saving and stimulating for the students.

In the current study, 37 students (in groups) most of whom had been noted to have code switched, and all of the 8 teachers (both native and non-native speakers of the English language) from the observed classes were interviewed. The student interviews were conducted with 4 to 7 students from the same class at a time. All the interviews were tape-recorded to be transcribed later. Transcribed student group interviews conducted in Turkish were then translated to English in collaboration with the colleagues who teach and study Linguistics and ELT.

In the interview, the students were asked questions as to why they think they use code-switching to see if code switching serves establishing rapport and empathy among classmates, if they feel more relaxed and confident when they are allowed to switch to Turkish, and whether they feel more relaxed and confident when the teacher switches to Turkish.

NNS speaker (Turkish) teachers of the English language were asked if and why they think they use code switching. The aim was to see whether their code switching involves empathy towards students. In addition, they were asked if they feel that some students become more relaxed and confident when they are allowed to switch to Turkish; and if they think that students feel more relaxed and confident when the teacher switches to Turkish. The NNS teachers were also asked why they think their students want or need to switch to L1.

NS teachers of the English language were asked questions such as whether some students use Turkish words and phrases while speaking to their classmates or to the teacher (although they know that s/he does not know the language) and what the reasons for this may be. It was also an aim of this study to find out how the NS teachers feel when students start speaking their first language in the classroom and to see whether they sometimes feel detached from the students as he/she speaks only in English. Other questions were about what the native speaker teachers do in such a situation and what their opinions are about how students feel when they are let to switch to their first language. The expectation was to find out if they sometimes feel that some students become more relaxed and confident when they are allowed to switch to Turkish.

The last question directed to all of the participants being interviewed involved 'narration', as mentioned above. It was an open ended question such as,

-“Can you remember an event in which a switch someone or you made had a deep meaning in that context. If there is such an event, can you tell about it?”

The students were interviewed in Turkish to have them understand the questions and reflect their thoughts better.

3.5 Data Analysis Procedure

After transcribing the audio- recordings of classroom observations and interviews, transcribed data were organised for qualitative analysis by using NVivo technique. For this purpose, the information derived from the classroom talks as talk sequences and interviews was grouped and coded into seven common themes (functions) . Views of the scholars and colleagues who study linguistics and ELT were consulted while naming and defining the themes to maintain reliability. Conversation Analysis method was used to analyse the transcribed recorded data.

3.5.1 Conversation Analysis (CA)

In the present study, a framework based on Conversation Analysis (CA) was used. CA approach was developed by Sacks and his colleagues in the 1960s and 70s. The approach involved an appreciation of interaction as a locus of social organisation that should be investigated in its own right (Sacks, 1992). A comprehensive definition of CA is that it is the study of recorded, naturally occurring talk-in- interaction which aims at discovering how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk in organised sequences of interaction (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008). According to Seedhouse (2005), CA has its own principles, procedures and focuses which are as follows:

1. Talk in interaction is systematically organised and ordered.
2. Contributions to interaction are not only shaped by the context but they also renew the context: In order to fully understand contributions to interaction, reference to the sequential environment in which they occur and in which the participants design them to occur is essential.
3. CA has a detailed transcription system, so no order of detail can be dismissed as irrelevant, accidental or disorderly.
4. Analysis is bottom-up and data driven: Data should not be approached with any prior theoretical assumptions regarding power, gender, or race; unless interactants themselves are orienting to it. (pp. 166-167).

CA has been widely employed in code switching research (eg. Auer, 1995, 1998; Wei, 1998; Liebscher and Dailey- O'Cain, (2005); Ustunel and Seedhouse, 2005; Ziegler, et al., 2012). Drawing on CA, Auer (1995) brings a third dimension to code switching which is the meaning it carries in talk sequences, beyond its mostly studied grammatical aspects and preconceived social meanings. For him, the meaning of code alternation depends on the sequential environment, thus there is a sequential implicativeness in that a speaker's choice of a language influences his/her or other speakers' subsequent language choices. Thus, CA method requires sequential analysis of conversation. CA approach to code switching in bilingual speech is different from the other sociolinguists' viewpoint (eg. Gumperz, 1982; Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Heller, 1992) in that, in

conversation, speakers are not assumed to switch languages in order to index speaker identity, attitudes, power relations, formality, etc., but rather, as Wei states (1998), “they do it to demonstrate how things as identity, attitude and relationship are presented, understood, accepted, rejected, and changed in the process of interaction” p. 163.

Turn- taking or the sequential order of talk which involves how turns are linked together is a crucial part of CA (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). Each turn is built on the one coming before it, and adjacency pairs, repair, preference, delays, pauses and overlappings all have meanings in a context. Wei (1998) explains how meaning can be derived out of a conversation by using the CA method: “A detailed, turn-by-turn analysis of the participants’ conversation.....can demonstrate how such issues as attitude, preference, community norms have been brought about in the actual contribution of the participantsthrough pauses, delays, turn-takings, addressee changes, repair initiators...” (p. 171).

CA is also employed as an effective methodology to investigate various dynamics of classroom talk-in interaction. In the present study, a framework based on CA is used. The rationale behind this was that the function of the switches could be best understood and accounted for by referring to the talk sequences in the conversational context (EFL classroom). Specifically, it was believed that factors such as attitudes toward L2 and the related culture versus one’s own, group norms supporting or hindering the use of a foreign language, social expectations related to teacher role versus student role, and learners’ proficiency level, resulting in the language choices of the participants at specific parts of a conversation, can be best examined by employing CA approach. For instance, a speaker starting a sequence changing the language choice may get a response as a dispreferred second pair reflected in silence, delay or a repair initiator, etc. indicating that the other speaker who insists on the same language is refusing what is wanted of him/her.

3.5.2 NVivo: The Qualitative Data Analysis Software

Qualitative data analysis is “pursuing the relationship between categories and themes of data seeking to increase the understanding of the phenomenon” (Hilal & Alabri, 2013: 181). NVivo was used to organise the qualitative data to form concepts, categories,

themes, to import the files to be analysed, and to store a place in NVivo for references to code text (working with nodes). Use of the software (NVivo programme) is not in analysing but in handling the qualitative data (Macmillan, 2005). In this study, NVivo is used to store the files including the transcribed interviews (8 teacher interviews and 8 student group interviews) and 16 transcribed classroom talks (2 classroom hours for each of the 8 classrooms) recorded during the observations of 8 classrooms (4 classrooms directed by NS teachers and 4 classrooms directed by NNS teachers) in the *Sources* folder of the programme. In addition, in the *Nodes* file, excerpts were stored in 7 common themes (functions) emerged from the classroom talks and interviews. These files were as follows:

1. activating, motivating and drawing attention;
2. comprehending;
3. feeling free while expressing meaning;
4. cultural orientation;
5. naturality;
6. negotiation;
7. feeling secure and relaxed.

The excerpts presented in Chapter 4 were copied and pasted from the NVivo files where they were stored.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The data related to what code switching serves in the examined EFL classes that emerged from the student group interviews, teacher interviews and recorded classroom talks were brought together and put into seven categories to be analysed.

These seven function categories were as follows: ‘activating, motivating and drawing attention’, ‘comprehending’, ‘feeling free while expressing meaning’, ‘cultural orientation’, ‘naturalness’, ‘negotiation’, and ‘feeling secure and relaxed’.

4.1 Activating Motivating and Drawing Attention

This function category refers to the use of code switching to have the students participate willingly and get focused on the subject in the EFL classroom.

4.1.1 Analyses of the Interviews with the Teachers and the Student Groups

In EFL classes, some of the students may have inadequate knowledge of L2. Those students have problems with expressing their ideas and comprehending what is being taught in L. As a result, they may lose their will to participate, moreover they may feel passive and left out. In two of the student group interviews with those who have native speaker teachers (NSTs), some students complained about it. They believe that a NNST who understood their L1 would make them more active and motivated. Letting them switch to L1 or understanding a word they had to say in L1 would probably help the teacher take the students’ perspective.

NST class/ St.Int. 1- To put some Turkish words while speaking in English helps us to speak more comfortably and the teacher can see that we are trying rather than being silent.

NST class/ St.Int.3- I wouldn’t prefer to attend the classes of native speaker teachers. I would just sit and not participate. Our teacher really tries but it is not possible for us to fully participate without speaking Turkish.

Yet, most of the examined teachers and students mentioned that both the NNSTs and the NSTs sometimes let the students use their L1 when they notice that they are demotivated for their inadequate knowledge level of the target language. Furthermore, not only the NNSTs but also the NSTs were told to occasionally use some words of the students' L1 for drawing their attention to the subject matter in the class, changing the boring classroom atmosphere, surprising them, making them laugh, etc. This may imply that the NS and the NNS teachers use code switching from time to time to take the student's perspective to increase their interest and performance in the EFL classes.

NST class/St.Int.2- In our previous module , when we have a Turkish teacher, the teacher used the word 'ama' as the Turkish equivalent of the word 'but' while speaking English. It attracted our attention to the lesson when we heard the Turkish word.

NNST class/St.Int.3-We feel more relaxed and closer to the teacher when we understand what he says. I don't feel like listening to the lesson when it is taught in English only and I cannot concentrate this way.

NNST class/St.Int.5-And we feel like giving up when we cannot ask the question in English . The Turkish teacher explains it in Turkish or English in such a situation, but the foreign teacher does not, so we pass the subject without fully comprehending it.

NST class/St.Int.7- There are some words he (the NST knows in Turkish like '*tavşan*' [tr: rabbit], '*oyuncak*' [tr: toy]. For example, one of our friend's surname is '*Karataş*.' He translates the surname and calls her 'Dark stone'. He researches the English meanings of all the surnames in the class. He asks, thinks about it. His trying to learn our language encourages us to learn his language.

I think it is something good to activate us in the lesson. For example, the teacher uses the words '*Tavşanlar*'(rabbits) or '*Oyuncaklar*' (toys) humourously. We want to attend the lessons more.

Lesson is like a show actually. When the teacher uses Turkish sometimes he can activate us better in the class. Otherwise nobody would enjoy the show. For example, we call a friend '*Oyuncak*' (toy), but our teacher's, an American's calling her '*Oyuncak*' is more

entertaining. If 80 per cent of the class listens to the lesson the percentage gets much higher this way’.

NST Int.(1)- Sometimes I just ask out of curiosity like what’s the translation of this word. It is like something like that and they felt motivated because they can teach me something, but that’s not very often.

NNST Int.(1)- They feel stuck. If they can’t express themselves however they like, they feel stuck mostly, because they don’t have the necessary language to express themselves. They know if clauses but they don’t know how to express themselves in the best way. They say “ Ok teacher. Never mind.” They give up. Yes, mostly they give up.

When there is no communication they feel demotivated. So, in order to motivate them you think you may sometimes switch or let them switch .

NNST Int.(2)- May be you can make some jokes in Turkish because you know sometimes they get so bored, so it can be good because they need two or three minutes to relax, so using Turkish during those periods is OK.

NST Int.(2)- I may use them from time to time in class or maybe just to freak humour. I say funny, slang words (in Turkish).

I use simple words or phrases. Maybe I will just say something in Turkish like ‘ ‘ *Ne yapalım?* ’ ’ (*What shall we do?*) or use informal nouns, like there was a joke like calling a student ‘ ‘*Canım*’ ’(*my dear*). It’s a kind of joke to engage the students.

NST Int.(1)-Sometimes like when I want to entertain students, I give them some comments in Turkish and they are mostly surprised.

Thus, Turkish words used by NS teachers catch students’ attention as unexpected stimuli. Moreover, a teacher (NST) who knows (L1) much less than they do enjoys them and her/his willingness to learn their L1 motivates them to learn L2.

4.1.2 Analysis of the Classroom Talk

Classroom discourse recorded during the classroom observations reveal that both NS and NNS teachers have the students collaborate in L1, find examples from their daily lives in order to comprehend the tasks and produce the correct answers through group games. In this way they motivate the students and make them participate. The teachers hardly ever made any use of L1 themselves but accepted the students' utterances in L1 and gave replies in L2. The two discourse makers, *yani* (I mean) and *hadi* (come on) used by the teacher in Excerpt 1, may serve to catch the students' attention and to motivate them. The students seem so highly motivated to collaborate in L1 that they use in- group identity markers in L1, such as *kanka* (buddy) and *abi* (cobbler) while working together.

Classroom Observation 10 NNST

The teacher is trying to get the students to describe Maria Montessori's method of teaching, using some adjectives.

Excerpt 1

1 T: provide them with individual learning programmes excellent

2 *yani*[tr: I mean]individualized learning what does that mean:

3 not independent by self means independent but

4 S: indivual

5 T: individual programme for each individual student what do

6 you understand

7 S: piriveyt (mispronounce)

8 T: private

9 Ss: @ @ @ @ @ @

10 S: I think she did

11 T: private lesson

12 S: yeah she did different activities (0.2) to develop

13 observation

14 T: excellent good what else

15 S: not a formal style

16 T: excellent it is not a formal style informal more flexible

17 dynamic inter inter what is that word: when students and

18 teachers they talk to each other inter:

19 S: interactive

20 T: interactive

21 S: they wanted to free children minds

22 T: they want to free children's mind

23 S: so that they will learn by themselves

24 T: so that they will learn by themselves *hadi* [tr: come on]

In the example, the teacher is a NNS of the English language. Yet, he does not use the

language he shares with the students (Turkish) except for two discourse makers. By using *yani* (I mean) which is a distinct and familiar stimulus for the students (a Turkish word) he may be trying to catch their attention, if it is not to indicate that he will explain it in other words to the students who did not understand the first attempt at explaining that. His aim in referring to their common perspective by saying *hadi* (come on) may be to have the students' cooperation to continue the instruction or to encourage them. It may also be used to emphasise 'group identity' , as Eldridge (1996) suggests for the *yani* (I mean) at the end of a sentence in English, in an extract of a classroom talk from the research he has carried out on Turkish secondary schools.

Classroom Observation 11 NST

Students are trying to find examples of advertisements that target children and they are speaking Turkish among themselves while doing the task.

Excerpt 2

-
- 1 T. so again tell your friend if you have any example about
2 advertisement that targets children... find examples
3 S1: *dondurulmuş balıklar vardı ya hani böyle nugget şeklinde*
4 *oluyorlardı* [tr: you know frozen fish looking like nuggets]
5 S1: *tavukları gibi hani balık sevmeyen çocuklar için falan*
6 *diyorlardı* [tr: looking like chicken nuggets, for children who
7 don't like fish]
8 S1: *hani yemesi için* [tr: you know, to make them eat the fish]
9 S2 : *ton balığı mı*: [tr: tuna fish?]
10 S1: *Yok ya hani normal balık gibi* [tr: no, any kind of fish]
11 T: okay do you know any advertisements that are targeted at
12 children:
-

In the example the native speaker teacher is trying to make the students participate. He wants them to find examples of advertisements that target children. He lets them develop their ideas speaking in Turkish among themselves. The students turn to their shared perspective and talk in Turkish about those advertisements they watch on Turkish TV channels which aim at influencing the children who don't like fish. It is a referral to their group membership. The lesson content (finding examples from Turkish culture using L1) was relevant to them so they showed affiliation with the teacher's pedagogical focus but none of them produced an utterance in L2. In the end, the teacher invites them to turn to L2, the target language which the students are expected to learn in EFL classes, by repeating his question.

Classroom Observation 13 NNST

The class is discussing the qualities required to take a job.

Excerpt 3

-
- 1 T: guys education is the most important factor when hiring a
2 person for a job for a position(0.2) so in groups of 3, you
3 have 10 minutes Oktay: if you want to... one can a, agree,
4 one can disagree... you can decide it (0.2)and after that
5 we'll have two groups to demonstrate their discussions here
6 okay: let's start yes for example guys hiring is something
7 like that... I'm the boss and I want an employee so I hire
8 that person to do the job right: let's start
9 S3: *neymiş*: [tr: what's that]
10 S4:birisi geliyor senden iş istiyor ona iş veriyorsun
[tr: somebody comes and asks for a job and you give him
the job]
11 (0.2) *orada*... [there] education... if I'm offering them the
12 job...because I need to work on this (0.1) you have to be
13 careful ... mathematic question, history or (0.2)
14 *hocam* experience *mı* education *mı*: [tr: teacher, is it experience or education]
15 T: experience is also important but there are also important
16 things as well like character but it's your discussion
17 S5: I think education has... important aspects... and are
18 important but education is more important than experience
19 I think. because you can use education in your life
20 because as you said in job...but very good point but...
21 with education you can talk with a persons and
22 you should learn your country's history it's necessary
23 for general culture *genel kültür* [tr: general culture]
24 S3: Education and experience in a job...with
25 university education you have, you can... I'm gonna practice
26 in it... education first.. experience

27 second *yani* [tr:I mean]... I think it's more important to
 28 take education for example you can learn for example
 29 something in work
 30 S4: yes there's a big role of experience yet... how can I
 31 say...for example teachers' job needs experience...
 32 S: *çok güzel discuss ettik hocam*...[we discussed it very well,teacher]
 33 T: you are good Enes (0.2)would you like to read the sample
 34 discussion:

In the example, the NNS teacher wants the students discuss if the most important factor when hiring a person for a job is education or not. The first response coming from a student is in Turkish (turn 9 Student 3: “*Neymiş ?*”(What’s that)) and it indicates that the student is not affiliated with the teacher’s pedagogical focus probably because she has not comprehended or listened to the teacher’s explanation. Another student starts explaining in Turkish to his friend and continues in English addressing the teacher. The teacher does not interrupt him. The student’s last sentence is (turn 14 “*Hocam, experience mı education mı?*” (Teacher, is it experience or education?)) The teacher accepts the question that involve code switching and replies in English (turns 15, 16). The students need to turn to their shared language to establish a common understanding (the reiteration of S5 in turn 23; discourse maker “*yani*” (I mean) by S3 at the end of a sentence in turn 27). These switches emphasise ‘group membership’ (Eldridge, 1996). The teacher shares their language since she is also Turkish. She does not use L1 but accepts what they say in L1. She lets them think loudly in Turkish, and replies in English what they have asked in Turkish. Hence, the students are satisfied with the discussion they have made as in turn 32 one of them says: “*Çok güzel discuss ettik Hocam*” (We discussed it very well, teacher).

Classroom Observation 13 NNST

The class is discussing the qualities required to take a job.

Excerpt 4

-
- 1 T: okay (0.1) so I want to ask you a question for example
2 Egemen you are the boss of a or a ceo of a very
3 well known international company and you have
4 5 candidates... so what's... 5 people who apply for the job
5 so what is the first thing that you look
6 when you look at the CV or when you meet this person face
7 to face: foreign language first then the countries
8 he or she traveled... more important...
9 S: and education
10 T: and education good Şeyda you:
11 S: foreign language.
12 T: foreign language good.
13 S: confidence.
14 T: Confidence so you you try to observe if this person's
15 confident or not Mine:
16 S: *Ben de...*[tr: me too] foreign language (0.1) for a good
17 foreign language, you have to, a good education, *yine oraya*
18 *çıkıyor hocam* [tr:it comes to the same point, teacher]
19 T: but is it always: imagine I was born in the USA so I know
20 English.
21 S: academic olur mu ama:[tr: but is it academic]
22 T: Sorry? In English?
23 S: *hocam bunu o kadar şey yapamam* [tr: teacher, I can't do it that much]
24 T: Try.
25 S: I'll translate *yok olmuyor* [tr: oh I can't] University
26 education
27 T: Good, so your friend says that the English you learned as
28 a native speaker can it be the same as you learn

In the example the student called Mine turns to L1 and the teacher accepts the use of this language which she shares with the students. Although she asks the student to speak in English, she translates what she has said in Turkish to English when the student fails to do so. However when the teacher insists in getting a reply in L2 from her (turns 22, and 24), the student gave up participating and ended her turn showing disaffiliation with the teacher's pedagogical focus. (turns 25 and 26)

Classroom Observation 6 NNST

The class is doing groupwork on relative clauses and the NNS teacher has given them some cards to be matched.

Excerpt 5

1 T: ok let's do it like that I will give you five minutes

2 to see all the papers it is your responsibility to

3 find the other answers to look for the other papers ok

4 let's take seven minutes who has the most answers will

5 win

6 Ss: ok

7 T: ok right: eighteen past it will finish

8 S: *kanka dördü yaptınız mı dördü yapan var mı*: [tr: buddy, did you do the fourth, anyone who did fourth]

10 S: *altıyla kimi değiştirebiliriz* [tr: with whose can we change the sixth]

Ss: (trying to find the answers to the exercise in Turkish)

11 S: *ikiyi yaptınız mı* [tr: did you do two]

12 S: *yediyi yapan var mı*: [tr: anyone who did seven]

13 S: *hayır beş beş beş beş* [tr: no, five five five five]

14 S: *aaa tamam* [tr: oh, ok]

15 S: *biri yaptınız mı esas abi* [tr: clobber, more important, did you do the one]

16 S: *iki olan var mı ikiiii* [tr: anyone with two]

17 S: *iki üç beş*[tr: two three five]

18 S: *bir ya da altı kimde: bir ya da altı sizde mi*: [tr: who has one or six?

Do you have one or six]

19 S: *bir ya da altı*: [tr: one or six]

20 S: *bir bizde* [tr: we have the one]

21 S: *versene onu* [tr: give it, then]

22 S: teacher will you check here

23 S: *yedisi olan var mı bir ya da yedi* [tr: anyone who has the seven, one or seven]

24 S: *yedi var* [tr: there is seven]

- 25 S: *değişelim mi*: [tr: can we change]
- 26 S: *kamile beşte üçüncü ne üçüncü*: [tr: kamile, what is the third of five, the third]
- 27 S: *beşi yapmadınız mı ya* [tr: haven't you done the five, ha]
- Ss: (almost only in turkish while doing the exercise)
- 29 S: *ben sana beşimi verdim*: [tr: I gave you my five]
- 30 S: *hayır ya biz* [tr: oh no, and we]
- 31 S: *ikiyi yapmadıysanız* [tr: if you haven't done the two]
- 32 T: change it with someone else
- 33 S: *ikiyi yapan var mı: pardon beş beş* [tr: anyone who did number two?
Sorry five five]
- Ss: (in turkish while doing the exercise)
- 34 S: *ho[cam]* [tr: teacher]
- 35 S: *[hoo]cam bitti hepsi* [tr: teacher, all have finished]
- 36 S: *bizim hepsi bitmedi iki tanesi kaldı ama* [we haven't finished all, we have two left]
- 37 T: no worries all the people may have mistakes
- 38 Ss: @@@@ (and speaking in turkish)
- 39 T: i will show you the answers and you check
- 40 Ss: (collaborating and checking their answers in Turkish)
- 41 S: *bir kimde yaaaa*: [tr: who has the one]
- 42 S: *dört kimde dört*: [tr: four, who has the four]
- 43 S: *d ile başlıyo* [tr: it starts with d]
- 44 S: *dört ile beş lazım* [tr: I need the four and five]
- 45 S: *m ile başlayan alkol* [tr: that starting with m is alcohol]
- 46 S: *hişt oktay ben kazanmazsam eğer şikeyi ortaya*
- 47 *çıkartırım ha* [tr: shush Oktay, if I can not win I'll reveal the set-up]
- 48 S: *beşi yaptınız mı*: [tr: have you done the five]
- 49 S: *lanet olsun* [tr: damn it]
- 50 S: *bizim bilemediğimiz soruyu iptal etti yaaa @@@* [tr: oh she has omitted
the question we couldn't answer]
- 51 S: *o fikir benden çıkmadı ya o benden çıkmadı* [tr: the idea doesn't belong to me,
it doesn't]

- 52 S: *dünyayı fethederiz artık ne yapalım atomu parçalarız* [tr: we conquer the World then, we split the atom]
- 53 S: *kim yazmış bunu ya* [tr: oh, who wrote this]
- 54 S: *harbi kim yazmış* [tr: really, who wrote this]
- 55 S: *hocam bu soruyu iptal edelim ya* [tr: oh teacher, let's ommit this question]
- 56 T: let's have some more practice about relatives
- 57 you shouldn't let them cheat it is your responsibility
- 58 to protect
- 59 S: they cannot protect themselves
- 60 T: page fourteen defining and non-defining relative clauses
-

During the class-work, the students collaborate in Turkish, and the teacher lets them do it so that she can make them active and have them participate. Turning their common perspective, beside speaking in Turkish among themselves the students use some specific Turkish words that indicate in-group markedness like, *kanka* (buddy) and *abi* (cobbler) (turns 8 and 15, respectively). The students seem to be extremely motivated and active as the game of finding cards also involve competition. During the class-work, the students not only collaborate in Turkish but they address the teacher in Turkish as well (turns 35 and 39). Although the NNS teacher avoids using L1 (Turkish) herself, she affiliates with the students and calms down their worries (turn 36) about making mistakes which they complain about in Turkish (turns 37 and 39). However the teacher's utterance and language choice in turn 56 to the student's request in L1 (turn 55) may indicate disaffiliation with the students' behaviour since her aim is to change the subject in the first sentence of the line, and in the second sentence she criticises the students for their behaviour during the group work (their disalignment with the teacher's pedagogical focus by cheating from each other). This finding is in parallel with the view argued by Ustunel and Seedhouse (2005) on the relationship between language choice and the teacher's pedagogical focus.

Classroom Observation 9 NNST

In the example, the class (the same teacher and students with that in Excerpt 5) is divided into competing groups to combine the given sentences using relative pronouns.

Excerpt 6

59 T: (writing on the board) ok very good now guys I'd like you

60 to practise a little bit ok: in pairs in twos maybe in threes

61 if you do let me give you one paper please make sentences

62 like these ones ok: there are only five questions for you to

63 practise a little bit then we'll play a game so maybe you two

64 can work together you two can work

65 Ss: (talking on the exercise in Turkish)

66 T: just write on one of them ok right: do it together

67 S: *bak şöyle yapıcaz* [tr: look, we are going to do it this way]

68 photographer is a person who takes

69 T: combine the sentences using relative pronouns

70 S: *sen doğru yapıyorsun diye bi şey söylemiyom* [tr: I'm not telling you are doing right]

Ss: (using Turkish while explaining how to do the exercise)

71 T: guys let me give you one clue one clue all the words start

72 with the same letter

73 S: yes

74 T: so think like that

75 Ss: (turkish among each other while doing the exercise)

76 *ne demek ya k ile mi başlıyo* [tr: what do you mean, does it start with k]

77 S: *onların değil o onların* [tr: it's not theirs]

78 S: *biz biri bulduk biri* [tr: the first one, we found the first one]

79 S: *sen yazmışsın* [tr: you have written]

80 Ss: *altı kim* [tr: who is six]

81 T: one minute left then we will change again ok:

82 S: *bi yardımcı olabilir misin ya* [tr: oh, can you help a bit]

83 S: *hocam bitti* [tr: teacher it has finished]

- 84 S: teacher finish change:
85 Ss: (nearly always in Turkish while doing the exercise)
86 T: ok now sssshhh again change your pairs with the other
87 groups change then=
88 S: =*hocam first group* [tr: teacher first group]
89 T: stand up and change
90 S: *sen o zaman bizimkini al* [tr: you take ours then]
91 S: *ben beşiktaştayım bugün ona göre* [tr: I'm at Beşiktaş today]
92 S: *biz bitirdik de sizin sorularınız ne kadar lanet tiiii* [tr: we have finished but your questions were damned]
93 S: *hayır beş daha rahattı* [tr: no, number five was easier]
94 T: so the winner of this game is group
95 three (0.2)congratulations
96 Ss: (talking about this in turkish)
97 T: group five is twenty three points
98 Ss: (applause)
99 T: group six twenty four
100 S: *brokoli bizi yaktı* [tr: broccoli put us into trouble]
101 S: *ya hocam biz ikinciyiz* [tr: teacher, we are the second]
102 T: you're not second place not second place I'm just saying
103 your grades they're the first i don't know the others so
104 thank youuuuu i think one part is enough let's do some
105 practice
106 now ok:
-

The NNST again avoids using L1 herself but lets the students collaborate in L1. In this way they have been so active and motivated that they are making comments (turns 67 and 70) and jokes (turns 92, 93 and 100) on the questions using L1 among themselves. In turns 102-106, the teacher gives an end in L2 to the student's Turkish utterance in turn 101, about their rank in the group work which has gone beyond her pedagogical focus and turned out to be a competition.

4.2 Comprehending

This function category involves the use of code switching to help the students understand what is said, told or taught in the target language (L2).

4.2.1 Analyses of the Interviews with the Teachers and the Student Groups

The interviewed students believe that it would be better if the teachers could not only let them use L1 when and where necessary, but also use it themselves from time to time. They said they need it while getting the instruction and feedback. In NSTs' classes, students who are more proficient in the target language (L2) help their friends understand what the teacher has said in L2 by translating it to their common L1 for them, and the teachers are aware of the situation. In order for a student fully comprehend what is being taught, her/his level of knowledge should be considered while determining the level of the language being used for instruction in target language classrooms. Switching to L1 may be a means to take their perspective in this sense beside others, such as; repeating again and again, using simpler sentences, speaking in a slower rate.

NST class/ St. Int.2.-In feedback and personal issues teachers should sometimes switch to Turkish. I repeat the same mistakes if I don't receive a feedback in my first language because I do not understand my mistakes clearly.

NST class/ St. Int.6.-Some of us do not understand, for example. They ask us to explain them as they know it is not possible for them to comprehend without asking to friends and they do it in Turkish.

NNST class/ St.Int.5-Yes, as we know our foreign teacher will never speak Turkish, there is always a barrier between us. We always feel like we have missed something and have not fully comprehended the subject.

NNST class/ St.Int.2-And we feel like giving up when we cannot ask the question in English. The Turkish teacher explains it in Turkish or English in such a situation, but the foreign teacher does not, so we pass the subject without fully comprehending it.

NNST class/ St.Int.3-The teacher always speaks English. We work in groups of four. Everyone in the group explains to each other the parts they understand in Turkish. It's useful because none of us understand everything the teacher tells because it is told in English only.

NST class/ St.Int.2-Once I was trying to tell something in English the teacher understood what I meant but my friends could not. That time I switched to Turkish to make it more comprehensible for my friends.

NST class/ St.Int.7-I agree with my friends.We have been learning English for the first time and we are not speaking English professionally. Switching to Turkish sometimes helps us in this sense. We sometimes feel excited while speaking English and we may forget a word we already know. If we say it in Turkish we can get help from our friends. It's helpful for students.

NNST Int. (2)-From time to time, when it's necessary, of course switching to Turkish can be OK. They feel better you know because sometimes they cannot understand some concepts or difficult things, so they switch to Turkish sometimes. It can work really well for students...There are weaker groups, so I need to switch to Turkish, because if I don't, I'll lose all my students. Because even if I make Turkish explanations they find it difficult to follow the lesson. So, without any Turkish it will be really difficult.

NST Int. (3)-There are always weaker and stronger students in the class and sometimes the stronger students explain the same topic to weaker students in Turkish. This one maybe helpful but still it means weaker students don't make enough effort. They don't try.

NST Int. (1)-In this module, my integrated classes with lower level students have some troubles of understanding the grammar, because I can't explain them in Turkish, so they're relying a lot to their friends. After I give some explanations, they help each other. Of course I let them do that.

NNST Int. (1)-If they don't understand at all and if they can't instruct to one another, yes I sometimes give instructions in Turkish, but only if necessary...To get a better understanding maybe, because they really don't understand sometimes, they're more

confused when they try to explain it again and again in English. They're more confused and you feel that if you give the word, only one word in Turkish, the communication would happen. I think that's the purpose only. When giving the instruction, that's the purpose...They have an 'Aha moment'. "Aa, ok, now I understood it..." If I give one word, they say "Aha, now I get it."

NST Int.(4)-I usually emphasize English only. When they ask what something means occasionally I will translate directly or we'll go on line together and look it up but I usually ask them: "OK. Give me an example." We try to describe it together. We don't have to translate directly. They can give me a situation, we can try to understand and then maybe we see we got it.

NST Int. (2)-Yes, they look mostly tender if there is an equivalent in Turkish. So, when there is an equivalent in Turkish I do use it because I think it helps them. They get through like a block of understanding... If it is a direct translation I use it because it helps.

NNST Int.(1)-I try not to mostly, but especially when I teach vocabulary I sometimes try to give the meaning in English. I give some examples, I show pictures, but they insist on getting the Turkish translation. '*E hocam (Oh, teacher)*, what is it *yani*, (what is it, then)?' and then sometimes I use one word, maybe two words to explain the word only, but nothing else.

One of the NNSTs told about a past experience in her early years as a teacher in which she was put into trouble for her A1-level students switched to Turkish thoroughly in front of the observers:

NNST Int. (2)-Five years ago I did my ICALT and for the observation, a teacher was observing me and some other observer was observing the teacher that was observing me. So, that was like a clash of observing in the class. So, I had a repeat class and in that class my students were so weak. They were A1 repeat and I had to conduct the speaking activity. I gave the instructions before because they were so weak and I was like 'Ok, you have to be working in a circle, in a group and then you'll answer these questions but please just behave well.

They were like “Ok teacher, no problem. Everything will be fine.” But of course, in Turkish. When the observers were in the class, I was like “Ok guys, now you have to work in groups”. The students were like this: “*Ne grubu ya hocam?*” (What group, teacher?), “*Hocam, ne yapıyoruz ben anlamadım*” (What are we doing teacher, I don’t understand). I was like “Ok, circle.” They were like “Circle *ne?* *Arkadaşlar* circle *ne?*” (What is circle? Friends, what is circle?) I was like “Guys, can you please work in groups?” I was like pointing, then “*Allah Allah. Valla ben anlamadım, ne diyor hoca?*” (Oh my God, I don’t understand, what does the teacher say?) It was chaos. I made that group but I was like I was going to fail that class but it was so nice because the teachers know me, how hard you try, you didn’t switch to Turkish.

In the narration above, the students were unable to take the teachers’ perspective, and the teacher could not take their perspective because she was being observed. Yet, the observers appraised her performance as high for not having turned to L1, although it was not pedagogically relevant that she did not use their L1.

4.2.2 Analyses of the Classroom Talk

Recorded classroom discourse indicates that students are allowed, even by NS teachers to talk in L1 among themselves and find the correct answers to the questions directed by the teacher in L2. There is solidarity among the students; they ask help from one another using L1 and they sometimes make utterances emphasising their ‘group identity’ (Eldridge, 1996). The teachers seem to tolerate this kind of cooperation as long as the students show ‘alignment with the pedagogical goals’ (Ustunel and Seedhouse, 2005)..

Classroom Observation 11 NST

The class is listening to three people talking about advertising.

Excerpt 7

1 T: so three people talking about what was the topic:

2 advertising and we need to take information about these things

3 (0.1) i'll give you this chart now for every person (0.1)

4 please take a note about the type of product they are talking

5 about (0.1) the brand—what's the meaning of the brand:

6 S: *marka işte.*

[tr : it's brand, you know]

7 T: yes in turkish it's the same

In the example illustrated in excerpt 7, after listening to three people talking about advertising. In turn 5, the teacher is asking what the meaning of brand is. In turn 6, the student answers in Turkish: “Marka işte (it’s brand, you know).” He stresses the common, shared knowledge by using “işte” (you know). This may function as in-group identity marker calling the support of his classmates who share L1. On the other hand, the student’s aim may be only to remind that in most of the languages similar words like ‘mark’, ‘marka’ are used for ‘brand’ or he may be addressing the NS teacher knowing that the teacher is familiar with their L1 as he has been living in Istanbul for several years. He invites the teacher to the students’ perspective, and the teacher accepts it and takes their perspective. The student also gives the equivalent of brand in L1 (turn 6). His reply is in English, but it shows that he understands and supports what the student has said. The thing important for the teacher is that the student has comprehended the meaning of the word. The student’s reply is in alignment with his pedagogical focus.

Classroom Observation 12 NST

The class is going through phrasal verbs.

Excerpt 8

- 1 T: okay we can work... we can start to work very quickly on this
2 grammar section here um we talked about phrasal verbs before I
3 think phrasal verbs... if I ask you... you guys know the
4 difference between going out and going down
5 S: *nasıl gidiyorsa, neler oluyor tarzında...* [tr: like how is it going, what's happening...]
6 T: we have 4 different sentences with four different words and
7 at this stage they do change... here they don't change but
8 sometimes they change a lot so for 1a he's going to the
9 supermarket what does it mean you can tell in turkish:
10 S: *gidiyor* [tr: He is going].
11 T: yeah he's going to the supermarket... take
12 S: *hocam şeyi nasıl ayırt ediyoruz...* to be going to *dan*: [Teacher how can we differ it
from 'to be going to']
13 T: exactly this is different... he's going to go... this is just
14 simple he's going to go.
15 S: *hani eve gitmiş daha gelmemiş* [tr: like, he went for home, but hasn't arrived yet]
16 T: let's just make it in the simple way... he's just going he's
17 going... but in B what's in this he's going up
18 does this mean literally the waste is going up (0.1) like to
19 the sky (0.1) to the ceiling what does it mean: Crazy yeah
20 it's becoming more it's increasing
21 S: *rise olabilir mi*: [tr: Can it be 'rise']
22 T: rise yeah can be rise... best word is increasing but rise is also the best
-

In the example given in excerpt 8, the teacher is explaining phrasal verbs. Although she is a native speaker of the English language she understands Turkish as she has lived and worked in Turkey for four years (as we have learnt during the interview).

She says, “You can tell in Turkish” (turn 9). The student makes comments in Turkish: “Hani eve gitmiş, daha gelmemiş (he went for home but hasn’t arrived yet”.) (turn 15). The student even asks the teacher a question in Turkish: “Rise olabilir mi? (Can it be ‘rise’?)” (turn 21). Since the student is at B level, he could have easily asked it in English. Yet the teacher agrees with his language preference and answers his question, but does it in English certainly: “Rise yeah, can be rise...” (turn 22). Similarly, a student asks in turn 12: “Hocam, şeyi nasıl ayırd ediyoruz... ‘to be going to’ dan? (Teacher, how can we differ it from ‘to be going to’?)” The teacher replies in turn 13: “Exactly, this is different.”

The students turn to L1 freely to learn the grammar rules better and the teacher supports them as long as they are in affiliation with the pedagogical focus. Furthermore, in turns 12 and 15 the students are trying to make comments and explanations about the target language grammar in L1, though not correct. It is the ‘metalanguage’ function of code switching which Eldridge (1996) proposed, describing; talking about the language or task, commenting, evaluating and making grammar explanations. In a small scale study carried out by Horasan (2014) in two EFL classes in Turkey the teachers and students were found to employ code switching mostly for metalanguage.

Classroom Observation 1 NNST

The class is comparing state universities and private universities. (Hacettepe is a well-known state university and Koc University is an outstanding private university in Turkey).

Excerpt 9

- 20 T: =ok imagine you go a very high point and you have two
21 options Koc university medicine or Hacettepe medicine
22 Hacettepe is a state but a good university which one would
23 you choose Koc is a good private university in turkey
24 probably the best one which one would you choose and why:
25 S: I'd chose Koc university=
26 T: =Koc university medicine not Hacettepe medicine (0.1) why:
27 S: my=
28 T: =medicine is *tip tip* [tr: medicine, medicine]
29 S: my cousin is going a is going a state university in
30 medicine
-

The NNST tells the equivalent item for *medicine* in L1 and reiterates it in turn 28 although the student has not asked or paused to think. Equivalence and reiteration are proposed by Eldridge (1996) as functions of student- initiated code switching. However, in this extract it is teacher- initiated and serves to provide the learners curriculum access (Ustunel and Seedhouse, 2005). (She may have realised that the majority of the class has not understood what 'medicine' means).

Classroom Observation 4 NST

The class is working on gerunds and infinitives.

Excerpt 10

1 T: ok if you look carefully any ideas any ideas what are we

2 going to practice here

3 S: gerund and infinitive

4 T: gerund and infinitive after certain verbs it's something

5 that we studied yesterday

6 S: about try to

7 T: yes let's start with sixty-nine a

8 S: sixty one:

9 T: oh sorry sorry sixty-one a

Ss: (turkish among each other)

10 T: you have your notes good

11 S: *bunlar şey ya hani şey gelince değişiyolar* [tr: you know these change when that thing comes]

12 Ss: (trying to do the exercise mostly speaking in turkish)

13 T: ok let's discuss sixty-one a

14 S: *to geliyodu ya buna* [tr: 'to' would come to that]

15 T: ok look aaaa you're reading a sentence and you explain why

16 this form ok: you need to read the sentence and you need to

17 explain why you use this form good do the first volunteer

18 yes ... please

19 S: *ikinci playing olucak* [tr: the second one will be 'playing']

20 T: experiment is it experiment: no it's not but remember we

21 use infinitive after the verb to try if a person tries to

22 his or her best maximum

23 S: (reads the sentence)

25 T: ok he fails ok good number two

26 S: (reads the sentence) he started playing a year ago because

27 he started for ever
28 T: ok good münevver:
29 S: just five one
30 T: you want to remember number five
31 S: yes may I
32 T: ok read it
33 S: could you turn down your radio I'm trying to work because
34 do your best
35 T: ok trying to succeed ok lets go back to number three
36. any volunteers
37 S: if you've made something too salty try to add some sugar
38 T: are you trying to do something or it's an experiment: are
39 you:
40 S: try adding some sugar
41 T: hı hı we use verb plus ing to make an experiment if we are
42 trying something new

In this example, the students turn to their own perspective by using the Turkish language while collaborating for doing their classwork. They are using meta language in turns 11 and 14. They are speaking in Turkish among themselves to understand the rules related to the English language easily and give correct answers to the teacher. Afterwards they keep on speaking in English throughout the session.

Classroom Observation 8 NST

Excerpt 11

- 1 T: it can be difficult to find a balance between:
2 Ss: work and social life
3 T: ok work and social life work what work means
4 S: responsibilities
5 T: responsibilities and [social life]
6 S: [social life]
7 S: a lot of responsibility or responsibilities:
S: @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @
Ss: (some words in english and turkish)
8 T: responsibility not responsibilities
9 S: *biri bu duruma bi el atsın* [tr: somebody handle the situation]
10 S: büşraaaaa
11 T: do you understand:
12 S: *kişisel olduğunda* responsibilities *ama genel olduğunda*
13 responsibility [tr: responsibilities when it is personal but
responsibility when general]
14 T: this sentence is like saying...
-

In the example the class is working on vocabulary. In turn 8, the teacher who is a native speaker answers a student's question in turn 7, saying : "Responsibility, not responsibilities..." Another student turns to students' common perspective and addresses the class in Turkish calling for the help of a classmate who has a good knowledge of vocabulary: "Biri bu duruma bi el atsın... (somebody handle the situation)" (turn 9). The student (Busra) whose vocabulary seems to be better than the others' explained it the way they can understand: "Kişisel olduğunda responsibilities ama genel olduğunda responsibility (responsibilities when it is personal but responsibility when it is general)" (lines 12 and 13). The student's utterance in L1 (turn 9) is a Turkish idiom implying calling forth social help and support, so it may serve as in-group identity

marker (Eldridge, 1996) as well. The teacher does not interfere with the situation; he goes on with another sentence in English.

4.3 Feeling Free While Expressing Meaning

This function category refers to code switching to communicate knowledge, thoughts, emotions without feeling limited due to low proficiency in the target language.

4.3.1 Analyses of the Interviews with the Teachers and the Student Groups

The students sometimes need to speak in L1 in the EFL classes especially to express the exact meaning because of the inadequacy of their vocabulary or grammar in the target language. Sometimes what they need may be to use one or two Turkish words to express themselves. Otherwise they may feel restricted and give up saying what they have started to say. The examined students complained about feeling limited while expressing themselves if they are not let to switch to L1 due to the inadequacy of their knowledge of the target language. Moreover, some of them told that they felt themselves bilingual as they sometimes needed to use some words from English in a Turkish context just as they needed to use some words from Turkish in the EFL classroom to express the exact meaning.

NNST class/ St.Int.1- When we want to tell something in English we sometimes ask each other in Turkish how to do it.

NST class/ St.Int.2- When I have difficulty in making a sentence, I switch to Turkish to make it more comprehensible. For example when we talk among ourselves we try to tell something in Turkish first then we translate it into English. We understand each other doing so.

NNST class/ St.Int.5- I can understand nearly everything in English. So, I have practical problems rather than problems about comprehension. Even if something is asked in English the answer is always made up in Turkish in our minds. Because of the lack of practical skills, we can not make up sentences thinking in English.

NST class/St.Int:7- I ask it in Turkish to express myself better and then I try to express it in English when I learn the English meaning.

- I use the Turkish meaning of a word which is the easy way, if I am not competent enough to explain a sentence in English because when I do not translate it in the way I want, I prefer to explain it in Turkish instead of making a mistake .

NST class/ St.Int.2- We can explain the same thing in various ways in Turkish, including the metaphorical explanations. However, we feel limited when we try to explain something in English.

- We feel like we are just focusing on subject matters and nothing else.
- In native speaker teacher's classes we just talk about subject matters because the teacher doesn't know Turkish.
- Sometimes when we want to ask something and can not say it in English we give up saying it.

NNST class/ St.Int.3- We don't feel limited if we are let to use some Turkish. For example, I find it hard to express my ideas in English but I don't have such a problem when I make the sentences in Turkish.

NNST class/ St.Int.5- When we don't speak Turkish we feel uncomfortable. We feel like the teacher is against speaking Turkish. It 's normal to insert some Turkish words. In our daily lives, I sometimes even feel like inserting some English words in a Turkish context when I have difficulty in finding the Turkish equivalents. So, I can do the same with the Turkish language but we can not interact with the teacher this way as there is not such an approach in the class.

NST class/ St. Int.1- Sometimes when we feel we are unable to explain something in English we give up saying it as we are not allowed to speak Turkish in the class.

NNST class/ St.Int.5- Even if something is asked in English the answer is always made up in Turkish in our minds. Because of the lack of practical skills, we can not make up

sentences thinking in English. Besides, we can feel excited while speaking in public and resort to Turkish to express ourselves practically and fluently.

NST class/ St.Int.4- After realising that our teacher could understand Turkish, we started speaking Turkish. Before that we were trying to tell everything in English but it was inaccurate so the teacher could sometimes have difficulty in understanding. But now she can understand us when we ask something in Turkish.

NST class/ St.Int.4- The only important thing is failing to give the same meaning in English as you can do in Turkish.

NNST Int.(1)- They feel stuck. If they can't express themselves however they like, they feel stuck mostly, because they don't have the necessary language to express themselves. They know if clauses but they don't know how to express themselves in the best way.

- I sometimes don't understand them, because they can't express themselves, so they say: "Never mind teacher." They give up.

NST Int.(2)-I feel like this too when I speak a little Turkish. I feel like stupid. I feel like I can't. I know what I want to say but I can't say it and you know you don't feel like you can be your whole self and psychologically I feel that so hard. So, I think they feel frustrated for that, but I think the deep down they want it. I try to keep pushing.

4.3.2 Analyses of the Classroom Talk

The classroom talks recorded in the observed classrooms reveal that the students sometimes employ L1 in foreign language classes to express more of themselves, their thoughts, feelings, beliefs and knowledge about various topics, concepts, phenomena. Both NS and NNS teachers let them do so.

Classroom Observation 2 NST

The class is talking about ‘trends’.

Excerpt 12

- 1 T: can you think about some famous persons:
2 T: so where people wear fashionable necklaces: if you think
3 about high culture (0.1) like rich people:
4 S: yes
5 T: so what could be the high culture they are belonging:
6 Ss: *caz müzik dinleme* [tr: listening to jazz music]
(they are discussing in English and in turkish among each other)
7 T: I’m thinking what culture they like if they go to
8 listen to music what kind of music do they
9 S: op=
10 T: =opera for example
11 Ss: (talk among each other)
-

In the example, the students use Turkish (turn 6) freely among themselves to develop and express their ideas in response to the Native Speaker teacher’s question (turn 5) about trends of people with high culture.

Classroom Observation 13 NNST

In the example the non-native speaker teacher and the students are talking about games children play at home and at school discussing if they are just for spending time or they may serve teaching something.

Excerpt 13

- 1 T: but guys are they real games or are they games which intend
2 to teach something: yes what do you say:
3 S3: *hocam* [tr: teacher]it's clear that these children don't
4 play game in the garden they start play game in the computer
5 or online games(0.1)so they have (0.1)they should start the school as soon
6 school as soon as they can understand something because
7 computer games is how can I say (0.2) *bağımlılık yapıyor*[tr:
8 cause addiction] addiction addiction
9 T: good so good point do you agree: so children should go to
10 school otherwise all they do is playing computer games(0.1)
11 who agrees with it: Who doesn't: your friend says that
11 children should learn something while playing a game so a
12 game should have a purpose do you agree:
13 S1: yeah(0.2) *hocam* [tr: teacher] I play a game nearly 6-7
14 years and I can't learn something about it (0.1) from it.
15 T: do you agree: how can you learn something from the game:
16 S2: because I'm a gamer
17 T: gamer:
18 S2: yes(0.2)you can learn anything because actually can
19 you(0.3) you can speak with people from another country you
20 can improve your English and if you can embrace(0.3)*kendi*
21 *görünüştünden çekindiğinden dolayı*(0.2)*insanlarla iletişim*
22 *kuramıyorsan oyun içerisinde=* [tr: if you are timid for your
23 appearance and cannot communicate with people because of it
24 within the game]

25 S1: *=ya bırak ya* [tr: ohh stop it]
 26 T: guys guys guys
 27 S2: I need a minute I need a minute we are not just talking
 28 about computer games (0.1)we are talking about=
 29 S1: =we are off topic now
 30 S2: *ama sen başlattın* [but you started it]

After a pause of two seconds, Student 3 uses a Turkish utterance in turn 7, and when he suddenly recalls the English word ‘addiction’ he corrects himself saying it twice. The student does not stop and wait until the English word comes to his mind; instead he turns to their shared L1 and makes the utterance ‘bağımlılık yapıyor’ (cause addiction) which the teacher and his classmates will surely understand. On the other hand, with his utterances given in turns 20-22 S2 makes an off-task talk completely in Turkish (disalignment, as suggested by Eldridge, 1996), may be for he feels so free to express himself in L1. Meanwhile, in turn 23, Student 1 interrupts him using the same language (L1), ‘ya bırak ya’ (oh, stop it!). S2 turns to L2 and goes on expressing his thoughts, but when S1 makes a comment in L2 (turn 29) that they are out of topic, S2 gives a reply in L1 (turn 30) which indicates rejecting the comment (as a dispreferred second part, as Wei (1995) argues). Here the code switching by S2 in turns 20-22 is ‘discourse related’ involving ‘topic change’ and being ‘speaker-oriented’ as he does not take into account the hearers’ linguistic preferences (Auer, 1984; Martin-Jones, 1995).

4.4 Cultural Orientation

This function category involves code switching to emphasise the existing group membership by referring to the shared culture or to establish group membership through finding aspects similar to one’s own in the target culture.

4.4.1 Analyses of the Interviews with the Teachers and the Student Groups

The examined students say that as they have the same mentality, same sense of humour and same grammar background with NNSTs, they can express themselves better to them and feel closer to them. On the other hand, when NSTs use some Turkish words

occasionally, they feel closer and ‘as if sharing the same culture’. Some students of a NST mentioned an incidence in which the teacher used a word related to Turkish culture that the students have had never heard themselves before. This is ‘negotiating cultural relevance’(Canagarajah, 1995).

Besides that, the students said they may sometimes use Turkish words to preserve the cultural meaning for they believe that English translation of some Turkish words which involve cultural dimension would not reflect the inferred meaning. Thus, especially in NNS teachers’ classes students sometimes need to use formulaic speech or employ L1 for reflecting their own culture exactly.

NNST class/ St.Int.5 - As to our relationship with the teachers, we have two teachers. One of them is Turkish, the other one is not. We feel much closer to our Turkish teacher. We can laugh at jokes and have fun together but it is not possible with our foreign teacher. We just talk about the lesson.

- As the teacher has the Turkish mentality we can laugh at the same thing. However, we can not think the same way with the foreign teacher even if the jokes are in English.
- I think similar to English language, Turkish language has also specific patterns. We try to adapt the Turkish patterns to English language. Turkish teacher can empathize with us in this point, but it is hard for the foreign teacher to empathise.

NNST class/ St.Int.3- I can say that when some phrases are attributed different meanings like idioms it’s hard to translate to English. So, I may have switched to Turkish when I tried to explain them since they are so cultural.

NST class/St.Int.6- We feel as if she belongs to our community, we feel better.

- Actually when she speaks English, we feel a barrier between her and us, because we have a different sense of humour.
- There is cultural difference between us.
- I feel her closer when she speaks in Turkish.

NST class/St.Int.7- Sometimes we can encounter critical words and sentences which occur within the subject. At that time using a few Turkish words that the teacher can also understand can help as if we came from the same culture. Then the teacher replies in English and we are influenced by that which means we can settle it in our minds better. It has been my learning style actually.

NNST class/St.Int.1- There were international students in our class. As the Arabic students were of majority and more religious, once the teacher turned to the Arabic students and said, "I saw Kabe (the holy place for Muslims) in my dream last night." I said: "*Hocam*, you are *mubarek* person".[tr:"Teacher, you are a Saint person"]. We laughed at it as they could also understand the word 'mubarek'. But it was nice speaking halfly Arabic halfly Turkish halfly English.

NNST Int.(2)- I mean, after having international students I realized that. Before that, while I was trying to give examples I used the Turkish context all the time. So, even giving examples, not using Turkish but giving example from Turkish culture helps. So, imagine using Turkish, it really helps.

NST Int.(1)- Of course it is. I think it is important for them to know that I'm interested in their culture, language. They can even be proud of some words, some ways of saying things. Anyway, they're really interested in my opinion about Turkey or Turkish. So, everytime I'm saying something about Turkey, they listen to it carefully.

NST Int. (2)- I let them teach me something in Turkish which I also think helps a lot with building rapport. Whenever I try to pronounce something that they're teaching me they laugh so much. Like a kind of phrase, any kind of local, cultural thing, like they taught me about Adana.

NST class/St.Int.7- He used the word '*hadım etme*' ('castrate'). We were talking about the Ottoman Empire. He gave us roles. One of our friends was the emperor and another one was his wife. The emperor's son was kidnapped. He was looking for his son in the play. In that scene he said : "*Onu hadım edebilirler mi?*(Can they castrate him?)" We started thinking about the word '*hadım etme*' ('castrate').

-We said “What is it?” We thought it was something in English. He told the story in English and said '*hadım*' ('castrate'). He then explained us its meaning.

NNST class/St.Int.2- There was a song ‘uptown funk’. I asked the teacher the meaning of the ‘funk’ once in Turkish. The teacher insisted on telling it in English. I then learnt that the word had a swearing meaning. In the end, the teacher said, ” I will tell you what it means in the break time.” Everybody laughed in the class.

Although translating the unknown words and phrases told in L2 to L1 may be useful for comprehending in the EFL classroom, the equivalent lexis to be used by the NNS teacher in Turkish in front of the students may be slang and inconvenient because of the Turkish social norms. Thus, the teacher sometimes may not prefer to directly translate such words to L1 in the class as it goes together with the related culture and its restrictions. The NNS teacher in St. Int.2 has avoided turning to L1 in the EFL classroom probably for the ‘group membership’ and ‘conflict control’ functions of code switching proposed by Eldridge (1996).

4.4.2 Analyses of the Classroom Talk

Recorded classroom talks in the observed classes reveal that switching to L1 and the related culture sometimes has a role as in-group identity marker or group membership indicator in EFL classes and enhances solidarity among classmates having a shared background. However, attempts to translate everything as it is in order to find similar aspects of L2 and L1 including their cultural elements to gain access to L2 can sometimes result in misuse of some phrases and cause misunderstanding.

Classroom Observation 11 NST

The class is talking about products, brands and advertisements

Excerpt 14

7 T: yes in turkish it's the same and whether they liked the
8 product or not okay: this information you'll take it down on
9 the papers (0.1)do you have any questions: type of product
10 brand and whether they liked it or not okay: please keep the
11 extras now no problem keep it well let's start... we are
12 going to listen it one time only one time okay:

13 S1: okay

14 S2: yes

Ss listen to the listening text

15 T : check your notes with your partner

16 S3:*ben karıştırdım* [tr : I confused)

17 T: yes: okay let's check what's the meaning of soft drink:

18 S3: *yumuşatıcı* [tr : softener]

19 T: beer:

20 S3: not beer no (0.1) I mean (0.1)just normal juice or coke

21 soda things yes

22 S4:turkish common drink *ayran*(0.1)*milli içeceğimiz*

[tr :buttermilk; our traditional drink]

In line 17 the teacher asks the meaning of soft drink, however Student 3 gives a wrong answer in Turkish which means ‘softener’. In order to correct her, the teacher asks in turn 19 if beer is a soft drink. S3 says that she means ‘normal juice’ like coke or soda. In turn 22 Student 4 makes reiteration (he repeats in Turkish the phrase he has already said in English) and uses formulaic speech (he implies that it is culture-specific and may lose its meaning when translated into English) emphasising the importance of ‘*ayran*’ (buttermilk) in Turkish culture. He also emphasises group membership by saying “*milli içeceğimiz* (our traditional drink). ‘Reiteration’, and ‘group membership’ are among the functions of student code switching proposed by Eldridge (1996).

Classroom Observation 5 NST

Excerpt 15

- 1 T: look how do you advertise something to each other: if you
2 buy something nice what will you do:
3 S: i use it you must use it ya
4 T: you will offer it to your friends so what's that:
5 S: c
6 T: word of mouth yeah
7 S: *dillere destan* ya [tr: oh, it's legendary]
8 T: yes and this is the most effective one right: because you
9 don't trust advertisements on tv or billboard but most
10 probably you will trust your friend right: if Merve says that
11 brand were nice definitely *Yasemin* will trust her more right:
-

In the example the teacher wants the students to discuss which way of advertising is more convincing. The teacher and the students agree on the effectiveness of 'word of mouth'. At this moment, one of the students misunderstands the English idiom 'word of mouth' and makes a wrong translation of it to Turkish: He uses the Turkish idiom that corresponds to 'legendary' in English (line 6). The misused phrase is a well-known Turkish idiom which has a quite different meaning. The student means the 'word' is effective because it has travelled from 'mouth' to 'mouth' and has gained much more reputation than it deserves whereas the teacher only means the 'word' is effective because it comes through an acquaintance's 'mouth'. Here, orienting to his own culture by employing L1 causes the student to misunderstand the word and ideas related to the topic. However, the teacher is unaware of the situation as being a Native Speaker of the English language she does not understand what the student has said in Turkish

4.5 Naturality

This function category refers to employing L1 when it seems unnecessary and artificial to the student to use L2.

4.5.1 Analyses of the Interviews with the Teachers and the Student Groups

The examined students and their NNSTs believe that another reason for their switching to L1 in the target language classes is being natural, or getting rid of artificiality in situations where keeping on ‘English only’ is unnecessary. Especially in NSTs’ classes, some of the students feel themselves funny and a bad immitator of the teacher as they could never speak using the correct accent and words. Turning to their own perspective by speaking Turkish in EFL classes is assertive in the sense that they are not immitators, they have their own language to use at least when English is not necessary.

NNST class/St.Int.1-It is inevitable to switch to Turkish because it is our native language. We are used to speaking it since the age of 0.

- While my friend, Adil is sitting next to me I do not feel like speaking English, because we both know Turkish better.

NNST class/St.Int.5- We never speak English among ourselves.

- It’s bad not to speak Turkish although we know that the teacher knows Turkish.

NST class/St.Int.6- They rarely warn us but as our teacher is American we feel ashamed to speak English. That’s why I speak English more in other classes.I feel like she knows much more than we do because I guess the acquisition age for their accent is about three. We can only immitate them. Immitating is also wrong because funny things can occur when we immitate their accent.

NNST class/St.Int.4- We don’t feel it is necessary to speak English among ourselves.

- Once we asked the meaning of ‘permit’. The teacher made six sentences to describe it just to avoid saying its Turkish equivalent. It was really funny.

- And one day, she was trying to explain the difference between simple past and present perfect tense. She wrote the Turkish explanation on the board in order not to pronounce the Turkish explanation.

NNST Int.(3)-One reason is it's not cool. So, among their friends it's not seen as being cool if they speak constantly in English. So, I mean it's a peer pressure thing, you know, social acceptance thing. That's one reason. If they were more mature students, they would be more cautious or careful about improving their English. They wouldn't be pressured by the surroundings.

NNST Int(1)-The classes seem more enjoyable when they talk to each other in Turkish or else if they speak Turkish all the time they can't have a better communication and the lessons are usually robotic. I feel like that, because the communication isn't natural, because our mother tongue is Turkish. If we don't use Turkish at all it's not natural. Everybody knows that. Most of the people in the classroom are Turkish but nobody speaks Turkish. It's an unnatural environment.

- When I came here last year I tried only speaking English and I observed that I have no natural communication with my students because also outside the classroom I started speaking English with them.

NNST Int.(4)-When they are in pair work or group work, even if you set the rules, they start whispering among each other in Turkish. Even if they can't do it, even if they have strict rules about that, they text each other in Turkish. So, there is no way. They send notes, they write on papers. It makes the environment of the classroom less natural. So, I sometimes say 'Ok', I sometimes ignore the use of Turkish in the class.

One of the NNSTs shared his opinion about it saying that it was not seen as being cool among classmates trying to say everything in English (NNST Int. 3). Sometimes they resist to use L2 and talk about the related culture and turn to their own in NSTs' classes. On the other hand, in NNS teachers' classes, they not only turn to L1 but also expect the teachers to do it relying on the fact that they have a shared perspective (Turkish language and the related culture) with them.

Thus, emphasising group membership by switching to L1 is implied to serve maintaining naturality and the students stated that they expect the same behaviour from their NNSTs as well (NNST St. Int.4 and 5).

4.5.2 Analyses of the Classroom Talk

The recorded classroom discourse also reveals that students resort to L1 to maintain ‘naturality’. They sometimes find it unnatural (artificial, unnecessary and irrelevant) to try to understand what is said and express what they think and know in L2 in a Turkish context, especially if they are not so proficient. By turning to L1 they save face, make fun of their classmates who insist on avoiding L1, emphasise group membership, or disaffiliate themselves with the lesson content and the teacher.

Classroom Observation 13 NNST

In the NNS teacher's class the topic they are discussing is 'education'.

Excerpt 16

1 T: experience is also important but there are also important
2 things as well like character but it's your discussion
3 S5: i think education has (0.1)important aspects(0.1)and
4 experiences are important but education is more important than
5 experience i think because you can use education in your life
6 because as you said in job (0.1)but very good point but
7 (0.2)with education you can talk with a persons and
8 you should learn your country's history, it's necessary
9 for general culture *genel kültür* [tr: general culture]
10 S3: education and experience in a job (0.2)with university
11 education you have you can (0.1) i'm gonna practice in it
12 (0.2)education first, experience second yani [tr: I mean]
13 (0.3)i think it's more important to take education for
14 example you can learn for example something in work
15.S4: yes there's a big role of experience yet... how can I
16 say...for example teachers' job needs experience...

The reiteration Student 5 makes in turn 9 and use of the Turkish discourse maker 'yani' (I mean) by Student 3 in turn 12 by turning to L1 as they are all (the students and the teacher) Turkish people in a classroom context and they are trying to express their ideas by making long sentences with mistakes in English which may look unnatural. By emphasising group membership and in-group identity through code switching, they may look more natural and 'save face'.

Classroom Observation 5 NST

In the native speaker teacher's classroom, students are doing an exercise about countable and uncountable nouns. The teacher has let them collaborate.

Excerpt 17

1 Ss: @@@@@.....

2 T: ok next one number eight what do you think:

3 S: *bi yere giderken tabi ki de ya* [tr: oh, of course while going somewhere]

4 T: number eight

5 S: b

6 S: *katılıyorum sana* [tr: I agree with you]

7 T: claim what does it mean:

8 S: say

9 T: say something something ok number nine number nine

10 S: *resmi mi görüp yapıcaz ya* [tr: shall we see the picture and do it?]

11 T: ok just one group learnt that the noun itself is in the

12 answer you don't need something else

13 S: *olum bu zeka yok işte sende* [tr: oh my son, you don't have this intelligence]

14 T: look at her situation is it something positive or

15 negative: it is a negative situation right: he is in trouble

16 and he has problems to deal with ok so

17 S: *ay ben cevap veremedim* [tr: oh,I could not answer]

18 S: *soru yoktu ya* [tr: there was no question]

19 T: who can count information: show me the person who can

20 count information

21 S: *ben doğru yaptım ya bu ne diyo ya* [tr: I did it correct; what's she saying?]

22 T: any kind of information anything ... you can give just give

23 us something

24 S: *hayırlısı artık* [tr: hope the best]

25 T: be quiet please

- 26 S: *hocam ikisini de doğru yaptım böyle çıktı ben napiyim* [tr: teacher, I did both correct but this is the result; what can I do?]
- 27 S: *allah allah* [tr: good heavens!]
- 28 S: *çok ağır ya taşıyamam diyor çok ağır* [tr: he says it's too heavy; I can't carry]
- 29 T: ok so
- 30 S: *kullanılmıyo demek ki* [tr: this means it is not used]
- 31 T: you see potato because we don't count rice milk potato
- 32 and so on it's a kind of substance
- 33 S: *bence öteki de olabilir* [tr: I think it may be the other one as well]
- 34 S: *ben baktım anlamadım* [tr: I looked but I couldn't understand]
- 35 S: oh noooo *noluyo ya*: [tr: what happens?]
- 36 T: remember after noun we don't need a noun here we have a
37. noun
- Ss: (always in turkish among each other while doing the exercise)
- 38 S: *aaa beş oldu ya baksana* [tr: oh look it's five now]
- 39 T: ok very good good because any person ...
-

Most of the students' utterances in L2 are not for understanding or explaining what she has asked but they are rather for sustaining naturalness among themselves through joking and making fun of what their classmates say (lines 13, 17, 18, 21, 24 and 27). They seem to have completely turned to their own perspective for one of them addresses and tends to communicate even the native speaker teacher in Turkish (line 26).

Classroom Observation 3 NST

In the example, the native speaker teacher wants the students to do the exercise in their books on fashion which is their topic.

Excerpt 18

- 1 T yes in istanbul there is pretty of street music and
2 documentaries about and what
3 S: graffiti
4 T: graffiti yes so there is also some connection of
5 subculture to fashion so when lots of people start to
6 do something it may also be fashion maybe years later
7 and there are words connected to fashion in exercise
8 6A maybe already you know some of these words but without
9 looking at dictionaries try to match the words with the
10 meanings
Ss: (doing the exercise talking in turkish among each other)
11 S: *bunlar o kadar sıcak tutuyo ki kışın* [tr: those keep so hot in winter]
12 S: *ayakkabıların pisliğine bak* [tr: look how dirty the shoes are!]
13 T: ok so what colors are fashionable now
14 S: yellow
15 S: white
16 S: yellow
17 S: blue
-

While the students are doing the exercise talking in Turkish among themselves, some of them show disalignment (Eldridge, 1996) with the pedagogical focus of the teacher and the lesson content probably finding them irrelevant or unnecessary. They start making comments about the pictures in their book loudly in Turkish (lines 11 and 12). They keep on chatting as if they were outside the EFL classroom until in line 13 the teacher interrupts to turn them back to the subject of the classroom discourse.

Classroom Observation 3 NST

The NS teacher's class given in Excerpt 17 go on talking about fashion.

Excerpt 19

- 25 T: who
26 S: yes david beckham's sons
27 T: why they are so fashionable
28 S: because the son (0.2) popular brand connected with son
29 burberry
30 T: aaaaa so they're wearing burberry ok:
31 S: *öyle miymiş*: [tr: Is that so?]
32 T: who has tried to make a fashion statement
33 T: now let's listen small conversation
34 S: *kaç dakika var* [tr: How many minutes more?]
35 S: *25 falan olabilir* [tr: may be around 25]
36 T: have you ever thought about working in a cloth store
37 or a fashion shop would it be fun or do you think it
38 will be boring (0.3)
39 S: *evet* [tr: yes]
40 T: whenever I go to buy some clothes I usually
41 they are always looking at their watch maybe it is not
42 so fun but deciding clothes would be fun decide ok let's
43 listen to a small conversation and
44 S: *dinliyecez dinliyecez profta yapıcaz proficiencyde* [tr: we'll listen,
we'll listen and do them at prof, at proficiency]
45 T: before that
-

Some of the students seem to have been bored of using L2 for a long time talking about a foreign culture (speaking in English and talking about fashion objects related to British culture like David Beckham's sons, burberry, etc.) which is of little relevance to them due to cultural distance.

They may have found all the attempt artificial and unnecessary. This may be why they turn to L1 and start making off-task talk (lines 31, 34, 35, 39, and 44). In turn 31, the student's question is sarcastic indicating that he is not interested. Lines 34 and 35 are about how many minutes there are for the lesson to end, and the "evet"(yes) in turn 39 shows disalignment and indicating that the student is bored of the discourse in L2. When the teacher notices that some of them are bored and are looking at their watches, he passes on to a more interesting activity and wants them to listen to a small conversation about it (lines 41-43). A student's utterance with code switching to L1 in turn 44 indicates that he keeps himself outside the activity and underlines that they are students and are involved just for the proficiency exam. Moreover, his talking in behalf of the whole class turning to L1 may imply in group membership and identity emphasising that their natural language is L1 and what they are doing currently is unnatural. This finding is in parallel with the results of a small scale study carried out in an EFL classroom that code switching can be a strategy to avoid communication about lesson content that has little or no relevance to learners (Rathert, 2012).

4.6 Negotiation

This function category refers to students' speaking in L2 in return for being allowed to switch to L1 or their teachers' employing L1 occasionally.

4.6.1 Analyses of the Interviews with the Teachers and the Student Groups

The students would cooperate with the teacher to speak in English in case s/he let them speak some Turkish. In a way, it involves reciprocity. If s/he took their perspective, they would take hers/his in response. Otherwise, they would distance themselves from the teacher, the target language and the lesson content and turn to their shared perspective (the Turkish language, Turkish culture, common needs and expectations of prep students, etc.) as classmates. Both the NSTs and the NNSTs have experienced this conditionality and mostly tried to give them what they wanted to have them cooperate.

NST class/St.Int7- It is like resisting actually. Like if I do not speak in Turkish I will not speak English either. I go on speaking with friends and stop the dialogue with the teacher but sometimes talk to the teacher as well.

NNST Int.(2)- I do. I keep on, for example, I ask the question in English. They answer me in Turkish. I ask it in English again, so I made a comment on the question. They made the comment in Turkish again.

NNST Int.(4)- It's like a bargain between me and the students all the time, to use English or Turkish, but they open some doors, when you, as a teacher, open some doors, when you give them the opportunity to speak Turkish in some cases. They respect your choice of, you know, putting them into situations where they have to use English. They say "It's . You let me speak Turkish at times. Now, it's my turn to give you some reward for doing that". It's like a bargain. They respect me because I let them at times and then they give me back. They do it as a pay back to me.

NST Int.(2)- I try to say like "Excuse me? In English?" They know I understand, but instead of warning, a kind of just fake not understanding. If I get a hard point, I listen to them in Turkish, explain in English. I try not to explain in Turkish. They tell me a sentence. I will understand it in Turkish and then I'll say "Ok. I got you. Now, in English." and usually that works.

In this way students may be asserting 'group membership' (Canagarajah, 1995; Eldridge, 1996) and the situation may involve 'negotiation of identities'(Canagarajah, 1995) between the students and their NS teacher. However they do the same with their NNS teacher for s/he represents the target language in the classroom assuming the role of a NS of the language, thereby showing 'disalignment' (Eldridge, 1996) with the L1 s/he shares with the students.

4.6.2 Analyses of the Classroom Talk

The recorded classroom discourse reveals the existence of a kind of reciprocity between the students and the teacher about using L2 and L1. Both the NS and the NNS teachers' second turns to students' utterances in L1 are consistently in L2.

On the other hand, a student can shift the focus of talk away from the teacher's pedagogical concerns and start speaking totally in L1 complaining about the teacher's behaviour that s/he thinks has put him/her into trouble until the teacher makes a concession (Excerpt 20, lines 11, 12, and 13).

Classroom Observation 12 NST

The class is going to talk about packaging industry and recycling, but before that the NST makes an explanation about a change in their course programme for today.

Excerpt 20

- 1 T: anybody have any plans: anybody have exciting weekend plans:
2 study: yeah I recommend it presentation and presentation you
3 guys are so much adventurous its cause is the short (0.1) but
4 think of you have so much english that you've learned in such
5 a short amount of time yeah(0.1) I just have some pictures I
6 want to show you guys yeah (0.2) will you shut up: huh: so
7 today we will have (0.3) hey guys I need you to put this away
8 in the class okay: all right so today as you guys know from
9 our text we have 3 classes together instead of four and the
10 last lesson you will do some writing we'll start the process=
11 S: *=hocam biraz geç söylemediniz mi: ben 40 dakkadır*
12 *yoldaydım bunu söylediğinizde* [tr: teacher, weren't you a bit late to tell it?
I'd been on the way for 40 minutes when you told it]
13 T: I apologize
-

Although the teacher is a NS of the English language, she understands Turkish since she has studied it for four years while doing a Master's in Eastern Languages (we have learnt that during the teacher interviews). The student addresses the teacher in Turkish using a complicated sentence knowing that she is able to understand it. She complained that the teacher was late to inform them about the change in their programme (implying that she would not have come to school if she had known it before). Being an intermediate-level student, she could make her complaint in English, though. Instead, she turns to the students' shared perspective (being a student in Istanbul whose first language is Turkish and having to come to school to learn English from far away everyday). In the related literature, the main idea of Myers Scotton's (1993b) 'negotiation principle' is that utterances have intentional as well as referential meanings,

so a change in code here may convey a complaint and dispreference.

The student shows disalignment by shifting the focus of talk away from the pedagogical concerns of the classroom, marking out of the conversational territory and assuming the teacher in a different position (as if she was her friend) (Eldridge, 1996). In a way, the student expects an apology from the teacher in order to cooperate and do what she wants them to do (a kind of reciprocity). The teacher gives a reply to what the student has said to her in Turkish. Although her reply is in English, she takes the student's perspective and apologises for causing trouble. Having understood what the student has felt and said and giving the required reply, she goes on with her instruction.

Classroom Observation 7 NST

The class is writing a 'for and against' essay.

Excerpt 21

- 1 T: alright everyone should have a paper by now if you
2 don't have get one quickly the topic is eda can you read
3 the first one
4 S: being self-employed is better than working for someone
5 else
6 T: oh it's very simple what kind of an essay we're gonna
7 write:
8 S: opini=
9 S: =for and against
10 T: for and against essay ok:
Ss: (respond in English)
11 T: in for and against essay how many paragraphs are
12 there: deniz
13 Ss: foour
14 T: deniz (0.2) there are four paragraphs
Ss: @ @ @ @ @ @
15 T: i liked the word four but i prefer senten[ces]
16 S: [ok]
17 T: remember the way you practice english is this
18 S: ok
19 T: so deniz how many paragraphs are there:
20 S: they are four paragraphs
21 T: there you go pretty simple alright first paragraph is
22 the
23 S: introduction=
24 T: =intro
25 Ss: (some words in English)and thesis

26 T: second:
 27 S: for
 28 T: we're gonna make this for third:
 29 S: against
 30 T: against [four]
 31 S: [conclusion]
 32 T: and conclusion ok thesis what's this do we agree or
 33 disagree with this idea here we disagree
 34 S1: agree
 35 S2: disagree
 36 T: if you disagree put up your hands quickly
 Ss: (in English)
 37 T: one person sorry democracy you disagree
 38 S2: *ya bu işte*[tr: oh, that's it]
 39 T: so my thesis would be disagree
 40 S1: *biri için çalışmaktan daha iyidir* [It's better than working for someone else]
 41 T: before we start talking about this subject here being
 42 self-employed what is the larger subject: self-employment

In the example, up to line 38, the students answer the NS teacher in English. The student who disagrees is pleased that the teacher has regarded his opinion, so he makes an utterance in Turkish indicating relief in turn 38. In line 39, the teacher states in English what S2 should have said or his own opinion: "My thesis would be disagree". Another student rejects the idea and defends the opposite in Turkish probably distancing himself from the teacher and taking the students' shared perspective (line 40). This is in parallel with the related literature since Li Wei (1995), bringing together Grice's co-operative principle' and Levinson's (1983) concept of 'preference in adjacency pairs' emphasises that dispreferred second pairs are expressed in the other language. However, the teacher does not take the student's perspective to negotiate ideas. He ignores what he has said and goes on with telling how to write an essay (lines 41-42). He does not enter the negotiation this time. If he had, he would have gone against the majority of the class.

Classroom Observation 12 NST

In the example, the class is talking about packaging industry and biodegradable materials

Excerpt 22

1 T: but packaging cuts down damage (0.1)they're going to throw

2 away: not exactly throwing away (0.1) packaging cuts down

3 damage

3 S1: *yani yırtıldı mı*: [tr: so is it torn]

4 T: i don't know if I understand because I don't know turkish.

5 S2: *hasarı düşürmek* [tr: to reduce damage]

6 T: you cut down the... Yeah. Yeah, in this sense, you mean (0.1)

7 exactly=

8 S2: *=azaltmak* [tr: to reduce]

9 T: you reduce it, you are making the harm less.

The NS teacher understands Turkish well, cooperates and responds in English to the comments the students make in Turkish as long as they are correct. (She does not cooperate and give a feedback to Student 1 whose response was totally wrong) (line 3). In a way, she enters into negotiation with them considering what they say in Turkish as long as it is right, besides answering in English to invite them to speak in the target language (L2).

Classroom Observation 12 NST

Excerpt 23

The class is talking about recycling and environmental pollution.

- 1 T: in this world, you make food you go to the store you buy
2 your food you use it and we throw away the result is
3 pollution what are related to pollution: when you throw away
4 what do you make (0.2) it's close to global warming we talked
5 about global warming yesterday i'll show one word you see the...
6.S1: *geri dönüşüm ne acaba* [tr: i wonder what recycling is
7 (0.2) i think you heard about the turkish *çevre kirliliği* [tr: environmental pollution]
8 8 T: recycling and there's=
9 S2: *=bence* [tr: i think it is] environment pollution
11 T: environment pollution (0.2) what kind of things can make
12 the environment polluted (0.2) unrecycled unrecycled
13 (0.1)unrecycled things (0.2) what do you think trash (0.1)
14 so these pictures they are called 7 days trash so there's an
15 artist in the US pictures portraits pictures his families
16 and friends and he took pictures of the trash that they made
17 in 7 days (0.2) bless you do you think this is a lot for 7
18 days no huh: i'll show you couple more pictures I have some
19 do you know what we call the things that we hold our food the
20 bags the boxes...
21 S3: *hazır gıda dondurulmuş gıda* [tr: package food, frozen food]
22 T: i can't understand sorry:
23 S1: *dondurulmuş gıda hazır gıda* [tr: frozen food, package food]
24 T: i don't know this in Turkish i [apologize]
25 S5: [frozen]
26 T: frozen food comes in boxes yeah pizza...
-

The students expect the NS teacher to understand and accept the utterances they make in Turkish and tell their English equivalents (turns 6,7, 21 and 23) in order to cooperate. The teacher either gives the reply they want (turns 8, 11 and 26) or apologizes for not knowing the Turkish meaning (turns 22 and 24). It is like bargaining for it looks as if they expect the teacher to understand the words they utter in L1 and give their equivalents in L2, whereas the teacher helps them in form of feedback she provides in English whenever one of them utters the correct equivalent in L2 (turns 11 and 26).

4.7 Feeling Secure and Relaxed

This function category refers to the role of switching to L1 for foreign language learners to overcome stress and feel relief.

4.7.1 Analyses of the Interviews with the Teachers and the Student Groups

The students share the view with their NS and NNS teachers that they are afraid to make mistakes and fail publicly while speaking English. When they are let to speak Turkish or when their teachers use some Turkish words they get comfortable and confident. *Feeling secure and relaxed* is similar to ‘to reduce anxiety’ which is one of the ‘affective functions’ of switching to L1 in foreign language classrooms, as suggested by Mattson and Burenholt (1999). As Collins (2001) argues, usage of L1 contributes to reducing the affective barriers of second language learning and helps learners overcome language anxiety. However, some of their NS teachers believe that this is an easy way and makes them lazy and unsuccessful. Below are some extracts from student and teacher interviews about relaxing function of code switching:

NNST class/ St.Int.1 - We feel relaxed since it is hard to describe some words in English. It makes us feel more comfortable and it contributes to our development.

- Teacher’s speaking English only may be an advantage for us to improve our speaking skills. However, we need relaxing sometimes and we feel under stress when we always speak English.

NNST class/ St.Int.5- We can speak English well as we are at B2 level but we feel more relaxed when Turkish language is used.

- They don't allow us. But as I know that the teacher understands, I ask it in Turkish as my friend does, the teacher explains it in English, but since I insist on asking about the parts I don't understand, the teacher switches to Turkish in further levels to explain the subject matter. I feel much more secure those times. Of course all of us are aware of it (that we shouldn't force her to use Turkish) but it is much more secure.

NNST Int.(3)- They give a sign of relief. They understand it, they feel more familiar with the teacher. They feel more comfortable, conceding their body language. And you feel that they want to learn English in Turkish, with Turkish, but that's not how you learn English. They feel more comfortable, happier, perhaps in the short term. But in the long term, when you ask them was it good they might say it was not.

NNST Int.(1)- They feel relaxed and more comfortable. They feel more secure when they switch to Turkish.

NNST Int.(4)- In order to feel them more relaxed and comfortable, I prefer to chose speaking in Turkish but not at all times.

NNST Int.(2)- I don't speak Turkish in the class but as I'm Turkish they feel more secure with me.

- Even if they are B2 and they are really competetitive in that language they want to know that when they are in a trouble there is somebody to switch to Turkish.

NST Int.(2)- When they think they're making mistakes, they switch back to their language. Then they finish their sentences in Turkish or just tray off like 'Yani' (*I mean*) or something reflective. Those are the most common cases. I know they get nervous about failing publicly. They switch to something they are more confident about or they reflexively fall back on their mother tongue.

NNST Int.(4)- They are ashamed. They don't feel confident. They feel like they are being attacked in a way emotionally and mentally. So, they are anxious at first, but they get used to it in time.

- If they have a problem, they feel more secure about solving their problems with me, because sometimes some students exaggerate the use of English and they think it's a very big deal and they can not manage it with their own knowledge. Those times, they at least, feel more secure. "If I have a problem I can discuss this in Turkish with my teacher". "If I have a serious situation, I can explain it to my teacher". That really makes it more confident and more open to conversation.

NST Int.(2)- She's for example, constantly raising her hand and constantly wants to speak, but it's always in Turkish. She's one of the most successful, hardworking students. She has the ability to speak English, but she gets very scared and whenever she makes one sentence in English she gets so excited and happy, but I think for her to get that level of confidence is hard, so she tends to use Turkish. It's the same for the other students because they speak slower, because it's hard for them to express themselves in a confident way, so they use Turkish.

NST Int.(3)- Well, sometimes they're just lazy, they don't just want to force and make their brains work, so they don't just want to bother themselves.

NST Int.(2)- I think it helps build rapport. I do, because I think they feel more comfortable but also I think it has disadvantages because they don't feel as pushed to speak English. I have to do more pushing because you know I'm not a hard teacher. I try to be less nice on this issue sometimes.

NST Int.(2)- I try to speak English when I'm in the classroom. A kind of like it scares them that I can understand everything in Turkish because they have to be careful with what they can say in the classroom.

Nevertheless, there is a paradox in that the students feel relaxed and secure when their NS teachers speak Turkish and understand what they say in Turkish about the subject matter in the class, but they seem to be scared sometimes that a NS teacher might

understand what they talk among themselves in Turkish. One of the NS teachers said she felt it among them (NST Int.2). This may imply that they also switch codes to disalign with the pedagogical concerns of the teacher and go out of the language owned and imposed by the NS teacher so that they can talk about whatever they like in Turkish as if they were not students in the EFL classroom with its requirements. Moreover getting too much relaxed by switching to L1 makes them lazy (NST Int(3)) and they do not spend any effort to speak English (NST Int(2)).

4.7.2 Analyses of the Classroom Talk

In the extract of the discourse recorded during Classroom Observation 13, the student's switch to L1 in turns 32 and 33 serves making him feel secure and relaxed.

Classroom Observation 13 NNST

In the example, the NNS teacher and her students are discussing children's need for education and play.

Excerpt 24

- 1 T: Okay (0.1)guys (0.1) let's do the second one (0.1) what age
2 do children usually start and leave secondary school:
3 S: fifteen
4 T: what about here in turkey (0.2) ten to eleven you guess
5 (0.1) any other: azerbaijan (0.2) yes:
6 S: secondary is after the primary school:
7 T: yeah
8 S: in my opininon the children should start to primary school
9 at five when they are five years old
10 T: yeah
11 S: then 2 years in primary school or (0.2) i don't know how
12 much primary school's [do]
13 T: [normally five years]
14 S: five years: so ten years old then when he's ten years old
15 he should start to secondary school
16 T: yes (0.1) in the past it was five and then it became four
17 so then what ages does compulsory education start and what
18 age does it finish (0.1) do you think these are the correct
19 ages: for example let's think about Turkey (0.1) children
20 start school at the age of five (0.1) is it a good age to
21 start school: why not
22 S: because they are...
23 T: sorry:
24 S: because they are children(0.2) because they are very
25 little and they should play games=
26 T: =good they can play games at school

27 S: but (0.3) in at school teachers don't play games with
 28 them and...
 29 T: why not:
 30 S: because I have a little girl...
 31 Ss: @@@@ @ @ *bu bir itiraf* [tr: this is a confession !]
 32 S: my sister (0.2) *çocuğu var* [tr: has a child](0.2) *özür*
 33 *dilerim* [tr: I'm sorry] I have a sister yeah and (0.1) he's
 34 (0.1) she's (0.2) her teacher only plays game in her school
 35 T: but guys are they real games or are they games which
 36 intend to teach something (0.1) yes: what do you say...

In turn 30, a student makes an utterance in English in which he misuses the word 'girl' instead of 'niece'. Some of the students say in L1 "this is a confession" and start laughing at him for his misstatement which carries the meaning that he has a child (line 31). The student is ashamed and in turns 32 and 33 he turns to L1 that he shares with his teacher and classmates to feel secure and relaxed. Although he, as an intermediate-level student, is certainly able to say in English "I'm sorry, my sister has a child" he switches to Turkish to do this. The function category *feeling secure and relaxed* here involves the 'conflict control' function of code switching which is defined as to mitigate a face-threatening act by Eldridge (1996), or 'reducing anxiety' proposed as an affective function by Mattson and Burenholt (1999). Thus, having made a mistake in L2, the student turns to L1 to overcome the situation and save face.

4.8 Summary of the Data Analyses

How code switching functions in EFL classes is examined and discussed in terms of 7 themes that emerged from the data gathered from the NS and NNS teacher interviews, student group interviews and transcribed classroom talks of the observed classes.

'Activating, motivating and drawing attention' is found to be one of the prominent functions code switching serves in EFL classes. The students believed they were more involved in the classroom activity and performed better when they were let to use their L1 and collaborate. Having difficulty in expressing their ideas and comprehending what

was being taught because of inadequate knowledge of the target language cause the students to feel passive and left out at times. NS teachers as well as NNS ones do not want the students to be demotivated and give up participating because of their inadequate English. In addition, some students get bored of the subject matter finding nothing in common with the target language and culture. Some of the NS teachers make jokes to catch their attention and to have their cooperation (NST Int.(1); NST Int. (2); NST St. Int.(7)). One of the NS teachers was observed and recorded to allow the students speak in Turkish among themselves and refer to their group membership by finding examples from their daily lives in Turkey, advertisements on Turkish TV channels, etc. to make them active and help them develop ideas as long as they affiliate with the pedagogical focus (Excerpt 2). This is what Canagarajah (1995) put forward as ‘negotiating the cultural relevance’ which is adapting the lesson content to learners’ life-worlds outside the classroom. Even though the NNS teachers usually avoid switching to L1 themselves, they let the students speak in L1 among themselves and refer to their group membership (eg.Excerpt 3; Excerpt 5) besides accepting what they have asked or said in Turkish by giving replies in English (eg.Excerpt 3) or translating their Turkish utterances to English (eg.Excerpt 4) to satisfy them and make them participate as long as they affiliate with the pedagogical concerns. Afterwards, they direct the students to the English language and culture for which they have attended the EFL classes. On the other hand, some of the NNS teachers used Turkish discourse markers that emphasise group membership probably to motivate the class, have the students’ active participation or draw their attention (eg.Excerpt 1; NSTclass/ST.Int.2).

‘Comprehending’ seems to be another purpose code switching serves in EFL classes. The interviews and classroom observations and recordings showed that the examined students tried to understand the vocabulary and grammar rules of the target language by translating to L1 from time to time. The students more proficient in the target language helped the others providing the Turkish equivalents (NST Int.(1); NST class/St.Int7; NST class/St.Int.2 The students with inadequate level of the language preferred the teacher make explanations and give feedback in L1 for them not to repeat the same mistakes (NNST Int.(2) Some of the NNS teachers believed that sometimes the students might need only one Turkish word from the teacher to comprehend the subject matter so

the teacher should give it to go on communicating (NNST Int.(1)). A NNS teacher made only one utterance in L1 throughout the lesson using equivalence and reiteration at the same time for making a word important in the lesson content understood (Excerpt 9). Some of the NS teachers supported the students who made utterances in L1 to explain a word in L2 as long as the utterance shows that the student had comprehended the meaning of the word (Excerpt 7; NST Int.(2)) On the other hand, one of the NS teachers shared his experience and belief that student code switching should not be supported as the students poor in English do not make much effort but expect help from those with more proficient English which is the easiest way (NST Int.(3) The students were recorded to switch to L1 for comprehending the utterances in L2, by referring to their group membership calling forth peer support and making use of equivalent items in L1 (eg. Excerpt 11 and Excerpt 7).

The students might also turn to their L1 and the related culture for ‘feeling free while expressing meaning’. Because of the inadequate vocabulary and grammar knowledge in the target language, the students sometimes needed to fall back on their mother tongue to express the exact meaning in the EFL classes. Otherwise they would get demotivated, give up saying what they have started to say, or at least feel limited. The students reported that they could turn to their L1 for this purpose mostly in NNS teachers’ classes since they understood why they needed to use L1 and what they meant when they used it as they shared the same language and culture (NNST class/St.Int.3; NST class/St.Int.2). Yet, their NS teachers who have got acquainted with the Turkish language and culture having lived in Turkey for some time did not restrict them much, accepted the utterances they made in their L1 and then went on communicating with them in L2 (NST class/St.Int.4; NST Int.(2)). It was surprising that some of the students stated they sometimes needed to use some English words while speaking in their L1 in a Turkish context, as bilingual people did (NNST class/St.Int.5). Additionally, in Excerpt 13 while code switching functioned to make students feel free to express their feelings, its ‘disalignment function’(Eldridge, 1996) also worked. Off-task talk of the student who started to express his thoughts freely in L1 (disaligned with the pedagogical focus of the class) was stopped and warned by his classmate.

‘Cultural orientation’ seems to be another function code switching serves which involves employing the students’ first language to refer to their culture. The examined students stated and their teachers told about them that they feel closer to their NNS teachers as they share the same mentality, sense of humour and grammar background (NNST class/St.Int.3; NNST class/St.Int.5), and they feel the same about the NS teachers when they use some Turkish words and give examples from Turkish culture in the EFL classes (NST class/St.Int.6; NST class/St.Int.7; NNST class/St.Int.1; NST Int(1); NST Int(2)). It is also negotiating the ‘cultural relevance’ suggested by Canagarajah (1995) which involves adapting the lesson content to learners’ life- worlds outside the classroom. These examples related to cultural orientation function also involve ‘emphasising or forming group membership’ function of code switching, suggested by Eldridge (1996). On the other hand, the students told about their belief which matched with what was observed that English translation of Turkish utterances involving cultural dimension would not give the inferred meaning just as Turkish equivalents of English utterances might not give the actual meaning or sometimes might be inappropriate with respect to Turkish culture. Thus; employing formulaic speech can help overcome misunderstandings arising from translating such words and phrases (Excerpt 14; Excerpt 15; NNST class/St.Int2).

Code switching might also help maintaining ‘naturalness’. It was perceived as artificiality and not seen as ‘being cool’ among some of the classmates to speak in English especially in situations where keeping on ‘English only’ was unnecessary (NNST Int(3); Excerpt 17). Therefore those students sometimes resisted using the target language both in their NS and NNS teachers’ classes. Moreover, they expected their NNS teachers to employ L1 at times. Making use of L1 at times, they might also be seeking support from classmates to avoid looking funny being a bad imitator due to their inadequate knowledge in L2 and the related culture. (NST class/St.Int.6; Excerpt 16). Particularly, when the lesson content is not relevant to the students due to cultural distance, they show disalignment and refer to their group identity employing L1 from time to time (Excerpt 18; Excerpt 19). Thus; they might be trying to stress that their natural language was Turkish (NNSTclass/St.Int.1; NNST class/ST.Int.5; NNST class/St.Int.4; NNST Int(1), they belonged to the Turkish culture, and they were in the EFL classroom to pass the

proficiency exam only (Excerpt 19).

The students would cooperate with the teacher and speak in English in case s/he speaks or lets them speak some Turkish (NST class/St.Int.7; NST Int(2)). Moreover, it was like a kind of ‘negotiation’ or resisting that the students turned to their L1 to tell about their needs and preferences and expected the teacher to take their perspective even if s/he is a NS of the English language and might not understand Turkish. As one of the teachers states, it is like a bargain (NNST Int (4)). In Excerpt 20, in response to the student’s blame in L1, the NS teacher apologises in L1 which resembles concession in a negotiation. The students do the same in NNS teachers’ classes. They make comments in Turkish to the questions the teachers ask in L2 (NNST Int(2)), and the teachers respond in L2 to the students’ comments made in L1 as long as they are correct (Excerpt 22 and Excerpt 23). There is a kind of reciprocity about using the target language and the mother tongue. As their teachers perceive and the researcher has observed, the students assert their group membership (Eldridge, 1996) by insisting on using L1 in this way.

The students were ashamed to make mistakes while speaking in English. When they could not find the appropriate word and make an absurd utterance while speaking in English it was face-threatening among friends. Inserting Turkish utterances might save face them. In Excerpt 24, being misunderstood for having made a wrong utterance in L2, the student turns to L1 which serves ‘conflict control’(Eldridge, 1996) and ‘anxiety reduction’(Mattson and Burenholt, 1999). They fall back on their mother tongue at least at the end of the sentence they are not confident about, using a reflective utterance in L1 such as, ‘yani’ (I mean), as a NS teacher stated (NST Int(2)). Switching to L1 was a way of getting the support of the NNST and the classmates when needed. Thus, they felt ‘secure and relaxed’ when they were allowed to speak Turkish or their teachers used some Turkish words (NNST class/St.Int1; NNST class St.Int.5; NNST Int(1); NNST Int(4)). However, some of their NS teachers believe that this is an easy way which makes the students lazy and impedes target language learning (NNST Int(3); NST Int(2); NST Int.(3)).

CHAPTER FIVE

5.1 Conclusions

Researchers have so far proposed and defined different functions of code switching relying on their own data. The function categories specified in the present study are discussed in relation with the function taxonomies defined by Eldridge (1996), Mattson and Burenholt (1999), Canagarajah (1995) and Ustunel and Seedhouse (2005) for the purposes of the study.

The first function category involves employing code switching in the classroom by the teachers for drawing the students' attention or motivating the students and having their active participation by allowing them use L1. The NS and NNS teachers in the examined classes told they switched to L1 deliberately while making jokes and student interviews supported this. As proposed by Mattson and Burenholt (1999), establishing intimate realations with the students, creating a supportive language environment are among the 'affective functions' of classroom code switching. One of the NNS teachers was observed using Turkish discourse makers which serves a social function emphasising 'group membership' and asserting 'group identity' (Eldridge, 1996). Specifically during group work in classes, students were observed to speak in L1 among themselves through which they build solidarity (Mattson and Burenholt, 1999). As Ustunel and Seedhouse (2005) put forward, teacher code switching for classroom management is an attention focusing devise to motivate learners. In addition, the teachers allowed the students collaborate in L1 finding examples from Turkish culture referring to their 'group membership' as long as they were in 'alignment' with the pedagogical foci. Group membership and alignment/disalignment functions of code switching were proposed by Eldridge (1996).

Another function category that emerged was comprehending which refers to the use of code switching to help the students understand what is said, told or taught in the target language. In NS teachers' classes, especially in vocabulary and grammar hours students deficient in linguistic competence needed help in L1 and received it from more proficient classmates.

In-group identity markers are used by some students to call forth the peer support through employing L1. Through emphasising ‘group membership’ (Eldridge, 1996), switching to L1 also serves calling help to comprehend the utterances made in L2. The NS teachers mostly allowed the students ask and get social help in L1 from their classmates. However, during the interviews, one of the NS teachers stated that code switching should not be supported, for the students poor in English do not spend enough effort to comprehend the utterances in L2 expecting an explanation in L1 to follow it, and this makes them lazy. The same point was made by Sert (2005) related to some drawbacks of code switching in ELT classes. On the other hand, as students expected from them, NNS teachers provided the equivalents of some utterances in L1 and made reiterations at times. These were ‘repetitive functions’ to clarify meaning (Mattson and Burenholt, 1999) or to provide learners access to language (Ustunel and Seedhouse, 2005). In the present study, the use of meta-language for comprehending by the students was very rare (Excerpt 8 and Excerpt 10) whereas in a recent study by Horasan (2014) conducted in a Turkish university the students and teachers were found to employ code switching mostly for meta-language.

‘Feeling free while expressing meaning’ was found to be another function category. The students stated that they feel limited when they fail to express the exact meaning due to their inadequate knowledge of vocabulary in the target language. They feel more comfortable with the NNS teachers for they share the same language and understand what they say in L1. However, their NS teachers can also understand some of their utterances in L1 as they have been living in Turkey for some time. Although it was stated as a need by the students and their teachers, in one of the NNS teachers’ classrooms it was observed that ‘feeling free while expressing meaning’ was exaggerated. A student started to make a long off-task talk completely in Turkish until being stopped by a classmate. Beyond expressing meaning freely, what worked there was the ‘disalignment’ function of code switching defined by Eldridge (1996) as marking out of the conversational context and the roles, rights and obligations of the participants within it. Thus, code switching should not be used indifferently in classroom context with its specific pedagogical goals and principles.

Cultural orientation as a function category involves employing the students' L1 while referring to their culture. The students stated they feel closer to their NNS teachers as have the same cultural background with them and to their NS teachers in case they refer to Turkish culture. The findings are in line with emphasising and forming 'group membership' function of code switching, proposed by Eldridge (1996). They are also in harmony with what Canagarajah (1995) put forward as negotiating the 'cultural relevance'. On the other hand, the need to employ formulaic speech while making utterances involving cultural dimension was highlighted by the students in the interviews and observed by the researcher. This finding supports a result of a study related to politeness strategies (Ahmed, 2017) which shows that because of their poor grammatical competence and cultural characteristics, EFL learners might produce some strategies deriving from their own language and culture to communicate with native speakers and this can be inappropriate in the target language .

The students stated they sometimes find it unnatural, artificial and irrelevant to employ in Turkish context a foreign language which they are not proficient at, to talk about a foreign culture which they do not know. The classroom observations also revealed that they turn to L1 and talk about off-task daily matters among themselves when the lesson content is not relevant to them due to the deficiency in linguistic competence, cultural distance, etc. They show 'disalignment'(Eldridge, 1996) with the pedagogical focus and refer to their group identity (Eldridge, 1996), emphasising that their natural language is Turkish and they are in EFL classroom only to pass the proficiency exam. They expect the same attitude from their NNS teachers and find them unnatural as they insist on using the target language all the time.

Negotiating is the function category which involves students' speaking in L2 in return for being allowed to employ L1. There is a kind of reciprocity between the students and the teachers about using the target language and the mother tongue. The examined students affiliate with the pedagogical concerns of the NNS and NS teachers in case they are allowed to speak some Turkish. In this way they may be asserting their group identity (Eldridge, 1996). Although the teachers accepted the students' utterances in L1, their second turns were observed to be consistently in L2 in response to students' first turns in L1.

Code switching serves feeling secure and relaxed in a face-threatening situation. The students stated they felt confidence and relief if they were allowed to switch to L1 when they needed. The NNS teachers have the same opinion with the students. However the NS teachers stated their view that this easy way makes the students lazy and hinders language learning. In one of the classrooms it was observed that after making a face-threatening mistake in L2, a student turned to L1 and made an explanation to make up and save face. This is in correspondence with 'conflict control' function of code switching proposed by Eldridge (1996), and 'anxiety reducing' function put forward by Mattson and Burenholt (1999). Collins (2001) also highlights the function of switching to L1 in reducing affective barriers of second language learning and helping learners overcome language anxiety.

There were not many noteworthy differences between the functions of code switching used by NS and NNS teachers. The NNS teachers, the NS teachers and the students stated that the teachers turn to L1 for the functions such as motivating the students, having their active participation and drawing their attention, making the students comprehend, feel secure and relaxed, and orienting to their culture, although they were observed to make hardly any utterances in L1 even for the first two functions. The NNS and NS teachers and the students stated that the students employ L1 for all of the seven functions and the classroom observations yielded the same result.

Functions of the teachers' code switching were in line with those proposed by Mattson and Burenholt (1999) and Ustunel and Seedhouse (2005). For motivating the students, drawing their attention and having their active participation, both NS and NNS teachers made jokes and fun in L1. There was only one NNS teacher observed to emphasise group membership by using L1 for the same purpose. For helping the students comprehend, some of NNS teachers turned to L1 making reiterations and providing equivalents while NS teachers allowed them ask and get help from their classmates in L1. NS teachers considered the cultural relevance and the students could refer to their own cultural elements in the NS teachers' classes just as they did in the NNS teachers'. The students collaborated freely in L1 in both NS and NNS teachers' classes. They also turned to L1 for naturalness and negotiation functions which may hinder foreign language learning in NNS teachers' classes as well as NS teachers'. In this sense, they view the

NNS teachers as representers of the target language as the NS teachers are. Hence, classroom code switching can not be considered as restricted with pedagogical goals. Functions of code switching in foreign language classrooms are of wide variety and comparable with functions of code switching in bilingual communities, as proposed by Ziegler,et.al. (2012) (for ESL classrooms), and Liebscher and Dailey O’Caine (2005) (for EFL classrooms) who find common points between code switching in language classrooms and that in bilingual settings .

5.2 Limitations

The present study has certain limitations that have to be stated here. First of all, there were only five NS teachers at the School of Foreign languages of the private university where the research was conducted and they were teaching the B2- level students at that time. In addition, some of the NNS teachers did not consent to their classrooms being observed and recorded. Thus, a limited number of students and teachers were observed and interviewed. (162 B2- level students and 8 instructors teaching them 4 of whom were NS teachers).

Secondly, a pilot study could not be conducted before the actual research not to take the extra time of the teachers and students who accepted to participate.

A third point was that the NNS teachers told in the interviews they switched to L1 at times and the students felt them closer when they did so. However, they hardly uttered a word in L1 during the classroom observation which may be because they were being observed.

5.3 Implications for ELT and Further Research

Relying on the outcomes of this study, classroom code switching can be expected to enhance foreign language learning considering its functions such as, drawing the attention and having the active participation of the students, motivating them, orienting to their culture, and helping them comprehend and speak in confidence having overcome linguistic and affective hindrances. Switching to L1 contributes to language learning, as many researchers argue (eg. Mattson and Burenholt, 1999; Eldridge, 1996; Collins,

2001; Canagarajah, 1996; Ustunel and Seedhouse, 2005), through increasing understanding, clarifying meaning, building solidarity with classmates, forming and emphasising group membership, and providing conflict control. However, resorting to L1 for maintaining naturality and negotiation should not be promoted as it may hinder learning L2 and the related culture which constitute a whole. Maintaining naturality which emerged as a function category in the present study goes together with ‘disalignment’ proposed by Eldridge (1996) as a negative function of code switching. As a result of finding the lesson content culturally irrelevant and unnatural, or thinking that speaking in L2 incorrectly in a context where nobody has it as his/her mother tongue is artificial, a student can reject participating. Additionally, negotiation which emerged as rejecting to speak in L2 unless the teacher responds to what the student speaks in L1 and comes to a concession can also impede foreign language learning. One of the NNS teachers (NNST Int(3) stated, “It is due to peer pressure, for social acceptance. If they were more mature students, they would be more careful about improving their English”. As Eldridge (1996) argued, the students in the foreign language classes he examined asserted ‘group identity’ by speaking in L1 where the ‘group’ did not act as the people of the same nationality as suggested by Myers- Scotton (1988) and Nishimura (1995), but the young peers and it should not be restricted by the teachers. Thus, students’ motives as adolescents should be considered by the teachers and led to a positive direction by providing learner-relevant lesson contents and organising attractive group work.

Further research may be carried out in large scale on code switching motives and behaviour of students at different proficiency levels and teachers’ responses to code switched utterances by the students with their pedagogical results.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AHMED, A.H. (2017). *The Pragmatics of Apology Speech Act Behavior in Iraqi Arabic and English*, Thesis (PhD), De Montfort University.
- ALFONZETTI, G. (1998). *The Conversational Dimension in Code Switching Between Italian and Dialect in Sicily*, In: AUER, P. (ed.), *Code switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. pp. 180-214. London: Routledge.
- ALPTEKIN, C. 2002, 'Towards Intercultural Communicative Competence in ELT', *ELT Journal*, 56(1), pp. 57-64.
- ARVA, V. & MEDGYES, P. 2000, 'Native and Non-Native Teachers In The Classroom', *System*, 23 (8), pp. 355- 372.
- ATAS, U. 2012, 'Discourse functions of students and teachers code switching in efl classrooms: a case study in a Turkish University.' Thesis (MA), METU.
- ATAY, D. (2005). Reflections on The Cultural Dimensions of Language Teaching, *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 5, pp. 222-236.
- ATKINSON, D. 1987, 'The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource?' *ELT Journal*, 41 (4), 241-147.
- AUER, P. (1984). *Bilingual Conversatio*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- AUER, P. 1995, 'The Pragmatics of Code Switching: A Sequential Approach.' In: MILROY, L. and MUYSKEN, P. (ed.), *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross Disciplinary Perspectives on Code Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 115-135.
- AUER, P. 1998, Introduction: Bilingual Conversation Revisited. in: AUER, P. (ed.), *Code Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge, pp. 1-24.
- AUER, P. 2005, 'A Postscript: Code Switching and Social Identity', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, pp. 403-410.
- BAXTER, P. & JACK, S. 2008, '*Qualitative case study methodology: study design and implementation for novice researches*', *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), pp. 544-559.
- BILGIN, G. P. & RAHIMI, A. 2013, 'EFL Teachers' Attitudes Toward Code Switching: A Turkish Setting', *International Journal of Linguistics*, 5 (5), pp. 1-14.
- BLOM, J.P. & GUMPERZ, J. 1972, Social Meaning in Linguistic Structure: Code Switching in Norway. In: GUMPERTZ, J. and HYMES, D. (ed.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehalt and Winston, pp. 407-434.

- BOZTEPE, E. 2003, 'Issues in Code-Switching: Competing Theories and Models. *Working Papers in TESOL and Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), pp. 1-27.
- BRAINE, G. (1999). *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- BULLOCK ,B and TORIBO, A.J. 2009, 'Themes in The Study of Code-Switching', In Bullock, B. and TORIBO, A.J. (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code switching* ,pp. 1-18 . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BYRAM, M. (1997). *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- CAMILLERI, A. 1996, 'Language Values and Identities: Code Switching and Secondary Classrooms in Malta', *Linguistics and Education*, 8, pp. 85-103.
- CANAGARAJAH, A.S. 1995, 'Functions of Code Switching in ESL Classrooms: Socialising Bilingualism in Jaffna', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6 (3), pp. 173-195.
- CETINAVCI, U.R. 2012, 'Intercultural Communicative Competencies in ELT', *Procedia- Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 46, pp. 3445- 3449.
- CHAMBERS, F. 1991, 'Promoting The Use of The Target Language in The Classroom', *Language Learning Journal*, 4, pp. 27-31.
- CHOMSKY, N. (1965), *Aspects of The Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- COHEN, L., MANION, L. and MORRISON, K. (2007), *Research Methods in Education* (Sixth Edition), London & New York: Routledge.
- COLLINS, T.G. 2001, '(Re)Considering L1 Use in Adult ESL Classroom: Effects on Learner Motivation, In BRAUER, G. (ed.), *Learning in Higher Education: An Introduction*. Westport: Ablex Publishing, pp. 61-76.
- COOK, V. 2001, 'Using The First Language in The Classroom', *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, pp. 402-423.
- COOK, V. 2005, 'Basing Teaching on The L2 User', In Llurda E. (ed.), *Non-Native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to The Profession*. New York: Springer, pp. 47-62.
- CORTAZZI, M. and JIN, L. 2006, 'Asking Questions, Sharing Stories and Identity Construction :Sociocultural Issues in Narrative Research', In TRAHAR, S. (ed.). *Narrative Research on Learning: Comparative and International Perspectives*, Oxford: Symposium Books (pp. 27-46).
- CRESWELL, J.W. (1994). *Research Design:Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- CRESWELL, J.W. 2007, '*Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*', (2nd ed.), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DAILEY-O'CAINE, J & LIEBSCHER, G. 2009, 'Teacher and Student Use of The First Language in Foreign Language Classroom Interaction: Functions and Applications', in: TURNBULL, M. And DAILEY-O'CAINE, J.(Ed.), *First Language Use In Second And Foreign Language Learning*, Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 131-144.
- DAVIES, A. (1991). *The Native Speaker in Applied Linguistics*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- DEBBIE, G.E. (2007). *Classroom Talk: Exploring The Sociocultural Structure of Formal ESL Learning*,. Bern: Peter Lang A.G.
- DELL, G.S. 1986, 'A Spreading Activation Theory of Retrieval in Sentence Production', *Psychological Review*, 93, pp. 283-321.
- DENZIN, N.K. (1978). *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological methods*, (2 nd ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill.
- DENZIN, N.K. & LINCOLN, Y (2005). *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.), Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- DOĞANÇAY-AKTUNA, S. 1998, 'The Spread of English in Turkey and Its Current Sociolinguistic Profile', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 19, pp. 23-39.
- DUFF, P.A. & POLIO, C.G. 1990, 'How Much Foreign Language is There in The Foreign Language Classroom?', *Modern Language Journal*, 74, pp. 154-166.
- EASTMAN, C. M. 1992, 'Code Switching as an Urban Language Contact Phenomenon', *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, 13, pp. 1-17.
- ELDRIDGE, J. 1996, 'Code- Switching in a Turkish Secondary School', *ELT Journal*, 50 (4), pp. 303-311.
- ERG (2013) Eğitim reformu giriřimi- Sabancı Üniversitesi. [tr: Education Reform Initiative- SabancıUniversity][Online]Availablefrom: [Accessed 07 May 15] <<http://erg.sabanciuniv.edu/sites/erg.sabanciuniv.edu/files/EIR2013.>>
- FERGUSON, G. 2009, 'What Next: Towards an Agenda for Classroom Code Switching Research', *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2), pp. 231-241.
- GAFARANGA, J. 2007, 'Code Switching as a Conversational Strategy', In: AUER, P. & WEI, L. (ed.), *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication*, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 279-213.

- GRICE, H.P. 1975, 'Logic and Conversation', In: COLE, P. & MORGAN, J (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 41-55.
- GROSJEAN, F. 1997, 'Processing Mixed Language Issues, Findings and Models', In: A.M.de GROOT & KROLL, J.F. (ed.), *Tutorials in Bilingualism*. NJ:Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 225-254.
- GULZAR, M.A. 2010, 'Code Switching: Awareness About its utility in Bilingual Classrooms', *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 32(2), pp. 23-44.
- GUMPERZ, J.J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HELLER, M. 1992, 'The Politics of Code Switching and Language Choice', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13, pp. 123-142.
- HILAL, A.H. & ALABRI, S.S. 2013, 'Using NVivo for Data Analysis in Qualitative Research', *International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education*, 2(2), pp. 181-186.
- HOBBS, V., MATSUO, A. & PAYNE, M. 2010, 'Code Switching in Japanese Language Classrooms', *Linguistics and Education*, 21, pp. 44-59.
- HORASAN, S. (2013). *Code Switching in EFL Classrooms: A Case study on Discourse Functions, Switch Types, Initiation Patterns and Perceptions*, Thesis (MA), METU.
- HORASAN, S. 2014, 'Code Switching in EFL Classrooms and Perceptions of The Students and Teachers', *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10(1), pp.31-45.
- HUTCHBY, I. & WOOFFITT, R. (2008). *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity.
- HYMES, D. 1972, 'On Communicative Competence', In: PRIDE, J. B. and HOLMES, H. (eds.). pp. 269-293 *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings*. New York: Penguin.
- JENKINS, J. (2014). *English as a Lingua Franca in The International University: The Politics of Academic English Language Policy*, Milton Park: Routledge.
- JIN, L. & CORTAZZI, M. 1997-1998, 'Expectations and Questions in Intercultural Classrooms', *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 7(2), pp. 37-58.
- JIN, L. & CORTAZZI, M. (2018) Use of the first language. *TESOL: Encyclopedia of English language teaching*. Wiley and TESOL International [Online] Available from: Accessed [8 Oktober 2019] <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt023>
- JINGXIA, L. 2010, 'Teachers' Code Switching to The L1 in The EFL Classroom', *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, (3), pp. 10-23.
- JOHNSON, D. M. (1992). *Approaches to Research in Second Language Learning*, New York: Longman.

- JOVCHELOVITCH, S. & BUER, M. W. (2000). *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook*, London: Sage.
- JU, FANG-AN. 2013, 'Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): A Critical and Comparative Perspective', *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(9), pp. 1579-1583.
- KACHRU, B. (2004). *Asian Englishes: Beyond The Cannon*, Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- KARAHAN, F. 2007, 'Language Attitudes of Turkish Students towards The English Language Use in Turkish Context', *Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 7, pp. 73-87.
- KEBEYA, H. 2013, 'Inter and Intra-Sentential Switching', *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3 (5), pp. 225-233.
- KILICKAYA, F. 2006, 'Instructors' Attitudes Towards English Medium Instruction in Turkey', *Humanising Language Teaching*, 8 (6), pp. 1-16.
- KRAEMER, A. 2006, Teachers' Use of English in Communicative German Language Classrooms: A Qualitative Analysis, *Foreign Language Annals*, 39(3), 435-450.
- KRASHEN, S.D: 1991, 'The Input Hypothesis: An Update', In J.E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics: Linguistics and language pedagogy*, (pp. 409-431), Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- KRAUSS, R.M. & FUSSEL, S.R. 1991, 'Perspective taking in communication: Representations of others knowledge in reference', *Social Cognition*, 9, pp. 2-24.
- LEVINE, G. 2003, 'Target Language Use, First Language Use, and Anxiety: Report of a Questionnaire Study', *Modern Language Journal*, 87, pp. 343-364.
- LEVINSON, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LIEBSCHER, G. & DAILEY- O'CAINE, J. 2005, 'Learner Code Switching in The Content-Based Foreign Language Classroom', *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(2), pp. 234-247.
- LIGHTBOWN, P.M. 2001, 'L2 instruction: Time to Teach', *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, pp. 598-599.
- LIN, A. (1990). *Teaching in Two Languages: Language Alternation in Foreign Language Classrooms* (Research report 3), Hong Kong: City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.
- LLURDA, E. 2004, 'Non-Native Speaker Teachers and English as an International Language', *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(3), 314-323.

- LLURDA , E. 2006, 'Looking at The Perceptions, Challenges, Contributions to The Profession', In: LLURDA, E.(ed.) *Non-Native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges, Contributions to The Profession* , pp. 1-10. New York: Springer Science+ Business Media.
- LODICO, M.G., SPAULDING, D.T. & VOEGTLE, K.H. (2010). *Methods in Educational Research : From Theory to Practice*, (2nd edition). San Fransisco, CA.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- MACARO, E. 2001, 'Analysing Student Teachers Code Switching In Foreign Language Classrooms: Theories and Decision Making', *Modern language journal*, 85, pp. 531-548.
- MACHAAL , B 2012, 'The use of Arabic in English Classes: A Teaching Support or a Learning Hindrance?', *Arab World English Journal*, 3 (2), pp. 194-232.
- MACKEY, A. & GASS, S.M. (2005). *Second Language Research: Methodology and Design*, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- MACMILLAN, K. (2005). More than just coding? evaluating caqdas in discourse analysis of news texts. *forum: qualitative social research*, 6(3) [Online] Available from: [Accessed 05 September 16]
<http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/28/59>
- MAHBOOB, A. 2004, Native or Non-Native: What do Students Enrolled in an Intensive English Program Think?, In: KAMHI-STEIN, L. (ed.) *Learning and Teaching From Experience: Perspectives on Non-Native English Speaking Professionals*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, pp. 121-147.
- MALIK, M.Y. 2014, 'Code switching as an effective technique of teaching English at the intermediate level in Pakistan', *Journal of Professional Research in Social Sciences*, 1 (1),pp. 56-68.
- MARTIN-JONES, M. 1995, Code switching in the classroom: Two decades of research, In: MILROY, L. & MUYSKEN, P. (eds) *One Speaker, Two Languages : Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code- Switching* . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 90-112.
- MASON, J. 2002, *Qualitative researching* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- MATTSON, F. & BURENHULT, N. 1999, 'Code-Switching in Second Language Teaching of French', *Working Paper*, 47, pp. 59-72.
- MAXWELL, J.A. 1992, 'Understanding and Validity in Qualitative Research', *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(3), pp. 279-300.
- MEB (2010). Milli eğitim bakanlığı ders çizelgeleri [tr: Ministry of Education Course Schedules] [Online] Available from: http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/ders_cizelgeleri.aspx [Accessed 07 May 15].

- MILLS, A. J. et.al. (2010). *Encyclopedia of case study research*. [online] Available from: [Accessed 24 September 15] <http://dx.doi.org>
- MOHEBBI, H. & ALAVI, S.M. 2013, 'An Investigation into Teachers' first language use in a Second Language Learning Classroom Context: A Questionnaire-Based Study', *Bellaterra Teaching and Learning Language and Literature*, 7 (4), pp. 57-73.
- MYERS-SCOTTON, C. 1988, 'Self- Enhancing Code Switching as Interactional Power', *Language and Communication*, 8(3-4), pp. 199-211.
- MYERS-SCOTTON, C. 1992, 'Comparing code-switching and borrowing', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13 (1-2), pp. 19-39.
- MYERS-SCOTTON, C. (1993a). *Social Motivations for Code Switching: Evidence from Africa*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MYERS-SCOTTON, C. 1993b, 'Common and Uncommon Ground: Social and Structural Factors in Code Switching', *Language in Society*, 22, pp. 475-503.
- MYERS-SCOTTON, C. (2002). *Contact linguistics: Bilinguals Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- MYERS-SCOTTON, 2005, 'Uniform Structure: Looking Beyond The Surface in Explaining Code Switching', *Rivista di Linguistica*, 17(1), pp. 15-34.
- NILEP. C. 2006, 'Code switching in sociocultural linguistics', *Colorado Research in Linguistics*, 19(1), 1-22.
- NISHIMURA, M. 1995, 'A Functional Analysis of Japanese-English Code Switching', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 23, pp. 157-181.
- ONWUEGBUZIE, A.J. and LEECH, N.L. 2007, 'Sampling Designs in Qualitative Research: Making the Sampling Process More Public', *The Qualitative Report*, 12(2), pp. 238-254.
- PAN, B. A. 1995, 'Code Negotiation in Bilingual Families: My Body Starts Speaking English', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 16(4), pp. 315-327.
- PILLER, I. 2002, 'Passing for a native speaker identity and success in second language learning', *Journal of Linguistics*, 6(2), pp. 179-206.
- POPLACK, S. 1980, 'Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in English y Terminoen Espanol: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching', *Linguistics*, 18, pp. 581-618.
- POPLACK, S. & SANKOFF, D. 1984, 'Borrowing: The Synchrony of Integration', *Linguistics*, 22, pp. 99-136.

- RATHERT, S. 2012, 'Functions of Teacher and Student Code Switching in an EFL Classroom And Pedagogical Focus: Observations And Implications', *Educational Process: International Journal*, 1,(1,2), pp.7- 18.
- RIEHL, C.M. 2005, 'Code Switching in Bilinguals: Impacts of Mental Processes and Language Awareness. In: COHEN, J. et.al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium of Bilingualism*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- ROMAINE, S. (1995). *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- SALI, P. (2014). An Analysis of The Teachers' Use of L1 in Turkish EFL Classrooms, *System* 42, pp. 308-318.
- SAMPSON, A. 2012, 'Learner Code Switching Versus English Only', *ELT Journal*, 66(3), pp.293-303.
- SANCHES, R. (1983). *Chicano Discourse*, Rowley: Newbury House.
- SAUNDERS, G. 1984, 'Creating bilingualism revised', *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, Supplement, pp. 24-35.
- SERT, O. 2005, 'The Functions of Code Switching in ELT Classrooms', *The Internet TESOL Journal*, 11(8). Available from: [Accessed 10 January 19] <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html>.
- SINCERO, S.M 2012, *How does stress affect performance?* [Online]. Available from: [Accessed 22 January 19] <https://explorable.com/how-does-stress-affect-performanc>
- SINGH, R. 1985, 'Grammatical Constraints on Code-Switching', Evidence from Hindi-English. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 30, pp. 33-45.
- SKINNER, D. 1985, 'Access to Meaning: The Autonomy of Language/Learning Connection', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6(5), pp. 369-389.
- SRIDHAR, S.N. & SRIDHAR, K. 1980, 'The Syntax and Psycholinguistics of Bilingual Code-Mixing', *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 34, pp. 407-416.
- TURNBULL, M. & ARNETT. 2002, Teachers' Use of The Target and First Language in Second and Foreign Language, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, pp. 204-218.
- USTUNEL, E. & SEEDHOUSE, P. 2005, 'Why That, in That Language, Right Now? Code Switching and Pedagogical Focus', *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(3), pp.302-325.
- VAN DER MEIJ, H. & ZHAO, X. 2010, 'Code Switching in English Courses in Chinese Universities', *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(3), pp. 396-411.

- VAN DER WALT, C. 1999, English as a language of learning in South Africa: Whose English? Whose culture?, *Language Awareness*, 5, pp. 183-197.
- WEI, L. 1995, 'Codeswitching, Preference Making and Politeness in Bilingual Cross-Generational Talk', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 16, 3, pp. 197-222.
- WEI, L. (1998). The 'Why' and 'How' Questions in The Analysis of Conversational Code Switching, In: AUER, P. (ed), *Code switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 156-176) London: Routledge.
- WEI, L. & MILROY, L. 1995, 'Conversational Code Switching in a Chinese Community in Britain: A Sequential Analysis', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 23(3), pp. 281-299.
- YILDIRIM, R. & OKAN, Z. 2007, 'The Question of Global English Language Teaching: A Turkish Perspective', *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(4), pp.54-66.
- ZENTELLA, A.C. (1981). *Hablamos Los Dos. We Speak Both*": *Growing up Bilingual in El Barrio*. Thesis (PhD), University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- ZHAO, Y. (2007). *Cultural Conflicts in an Intercultural Classroom Discourse and Interpretations from a Cultural Perspective*. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 16 (1), pp. 129-136.
- ZIEGLER, G., SERT, O. & DURUS, N. 2012, Student-Initiated Use of Multilingual Resources in English Language Classroom Interaction: Next-Turn Management. *Classroom Discourse*, 3(2), pp. 187-204.

APPENDIX 1

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

STUDENT INTERVIEW

1. Why do you think students sometimes switch to Turkish in English classes? Is it only for expressing oneself better or may there be any other reasons?
2. How do you feel or think when the teacher lets you switch to Turkish?
3. How do you feel or think when you are not let to switch to Turkish although you think you need to do so?
4. How do you feel when the teacher switches to Turkish in an occasion?
5. Narration:
“Can you remember a classroom event in which a switch someone or you made had a deep meaning in that context? If there is such an event, can you tell about it?”

NATIVE SPEAKER TEACHER INTERVIEW

1. Do some students use Turkish words and phrases while speaking to their classmates or you? If so, what do you think the reasons may be?
2. How do you think the students may feel if you let them switch to Turkish sometimes?
3. How do you think the students may feel when they are not let to switch to Turkish?
4. How do you feel when the students start speaking Turkish?
5. Narration:
“Can you remember a classroom event in which a switch someone or you made had a deep meaning in that context? If there is such an event, can you tell about it?”

NON-NATIVE SPEAKER TEACHER INTERVIEW

1. Do you sometimes switch to Turkish in English classes? What aims may it serve?
2. How do the students feel when you switch to Turkish?
3. How do you think the students feel when they are let to switch to Turkish?
4. How do you think the students feel when they are not let to switch to Turkish?
5. Why do you think the students need or want to switch to Turkish? Is it only to understand the subject or express their ideas better, or may there be any other reasons?
6. Narration:
“Can you remember a classroom event in which a switch someone or you made had a deep meaning in that context? If there is such an event, can you tell about it?”

APPENDIX 2

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

0.1	indicates a pause of 1 second
0.2	indicates a pause of 2 seconds
0.3	indicates a pause of 3 seconds
0.4	indicates a pause of 4 seconds
0.5	indicates a pause of 5 seconds
@@@	indicates laughing.
:	indicates a rising vocal tone at the end of an utterance.
= =	indicates utterances with no gap but also no overlap.
[] []	indicates overlapping of two utterances.
T	indicates teacher
S1, S2,	indicates student 1, student 2, etc.
Ss	indicates more than one student